

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2018 9:27:05 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David [Fotouhi.David@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

No problem. We can call you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 29, 2018, at 4:24 PM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Yes, that works for us, thanks. Will you set up a conference call or do you want to call us?

Best,
Joe

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 4:13 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hey Joe, can you do a call with David Fotouhi and I at 4pm tomorrow?

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 3:17 PM
To: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hello all,

Circling back on this and hopeful that we can schedule a call or meeting ASAP to discuss last Friday's announcement.

Thank you,
Joe

From: Lyons, Troy [mailto:lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Request: Connect with House Science Committee
Importance: High

David/Aaron:

Do you mind connecting with Joe from the House Science Committee (202-235-6843) regarding Pebble Mine? We visited this morning on the topic and your expertise is needed to provide additional background to Chairman Smith's staff.

Many thanks,

Troy

Troy M. Lyons

Associate Administrator

Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202-899-2490 (cell)

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2018 9:23:21 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David [Fotouhi.David@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Yes, that works for us, thanks. Will you set up a conference call or do you want to call us?

Best,
Joe

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 4:13 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hey Joe, can you do a call with David Fotouhi and I at 4pm tomorrow?

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 3:17 PM
To: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hello all,

Circling back on this and hopeful that we can schedule a call or meeting ASAP to discuss last Friday's announcement.

Thank you,
Joe

From: Lyons, Troy [mailto:lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Request: Connect with House Science Committee
Importance: High

David/Aaron:

Do you mind connecting with Joe from the House Science Committee [202-EX-8843] regarding Pebble Mine? We visited this morning on the topic and your expertise is needed to provide additional background to Chairman Smith's staff.

Many thanks,

Troy

Troy M. Lyons

Associate Administrator

Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202B096490 (cell)

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2018 9:13:18 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David [Fotouhi.David@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hey Joe, can you do a call with David Fotouhi and I at 4pm tomorrow?

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 3:17 PM
To: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hello all,

Circling back on this and hopeful that we can schedule a call or meeting ASAP to discuss last Friday's announcement.

Thank you,
Joe

From: Lyons, Troy [mailto:lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Request: Connect with House Science Committee
Importance: High

David/Aaron:

Do you mind connecting with Joe from the House Science Committee (202 225-8843) regarding Pebble Mine? We visited this morning on the topic and your expertise is needed to provide additional background to Chairman Smith's staff.

Many thanks,

Troy

Troy M. Lyons
Associate Administrator
Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202 225 8490 (cell)

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2018 8:16:51 PM
To: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David [Fotouhi.David@epa.gov]
CC: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hello all,

Circling back on this and hopeful that we can schedule a call or meeting ASAP to discuss last Friday's announcement.

Thank you,
Joe

From: Lyons, Troy [mailto:lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Request: Connect with House Science Committee
Importance: High

David/Aaron:

Do you mind connecting with Joe from the House Science Committee (202-225-8843) regarding Pebble Mine? We visited this morning on the topic and your expertise is needed to provide additional background to Chairman Smith's staff.

Many thanks,

Troy

Troy M. Lyons
Associate Administrator
Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202-899-2490) (cell)

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/26/2018 2:12:54 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David [Fotouhi.David@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Thank you -- any chance we could make around 10:30 a.m. work? Otherwise, 12:00-1:00 and 2:00-3:00 also work.

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:12 AM
To: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Happy to. Joe, is there a time today that works for you?

-Aaron

From: Lyons, Troy
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Request: Connect with House Science Committee
Importance: High

David/Aaron:

Do you mind connecting with Joe from the House Science Committee (202 225-8343) regarding Pebble Mine? We visited this morning on the topic and your expertise is needed to provide additional background to Chairman Smith's staff.

Many thanks,

Troy

Troy M. Lyons
Associate Administrator
Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
(202) 893-8480 (cell)

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/26/2018 2:11:36 PM
To: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David [Fotouhi.David@epa.gov]
CC: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Happy to. Joe, is there a time today that works for you?

-Aaron

From: Lyons, Troy
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:11 AM
To: Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Request: Connect with House Science Committee
Importance: High

David/Aaron:

Do you mind connecting with Joe from the House Science Committee (202-225-6743) regarding Pebble Mine? We visited this morning on the topic and your expertise is needed to provide additional background to Chairman Smith's staff.

Many thanks,

Troy

Troy M. Lyons
Associate Administrator
Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-306-490 (cell)

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/15/2018 6:03:54 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Great, sorry about the mix up!

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 1:03 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Yes, we got it, thanks.

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 1:02 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Have you received it yet?

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 12:32 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA Budget Briefing

Aaron,

I understand that that information pertaining to the EPA budget briefing on February 21st was sent out yesterday. The Science Committee has still not received any information on this briefing. Please send us this information ASAP.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman

P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/15/2018 6:03:01 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Yes, we got it, thanks.

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 1:02 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Have you received it yet?

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 12:32 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA Budget Briefing

Aaron,

I understand that that information pertaining to the EPA budget briefing on February 21st was sent out yesterday. The Science Committee has still not received any information on this briefing. Please send us this information ASAP.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/29/2018 9:27:42 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Fotouhi, David [Fotouhi.David@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Sounds good, please call 202EX-6843.

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 4:27 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

No problem. We can call you.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 29, 2018, at 4:24 PM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Yes, that works for us, thanks. Will you set up a conference call or do you want to call us?

Best,
Joe

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 4:13 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hey Joe, can you do a call with David Fotouhi and I at 4pm tomorrow?

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2018 3:17 PM
To: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Hello all,

Circling back on this and hopeful that we can schedule a call or meeting ASAP to discuss last Friday's announcement.

Thank you,
Joe

From: Lyons, Troy [mailto:lyons.troy@epa.gov]

Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 9:11 AM

To: Fotouhi, David <Fotouhi.David@epa.gov>

Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>

Subject: Request: Connect with House Science Committee

Importance: High

David/Aaron:

Do you mind connecting with Joe from the House Science Committee [202-225-8843] regarding Pebble Mine? We visited this morning on the topic and your expertise is needed to provide additional background to Chairman Smith's staff.

Many thanks,

Troy

Troy M. Lyons

Associate Administrator

Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

[202-566-2490] (cell)

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/15/2018 6:02:01 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Have you received it yet?

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 12:32 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA Budget Briefing

Aaron,

I understand that that information pertaining to the EPA budget briefing on February 21st was sent out yesterday. The Science Committee has still not received any information on this briefing. Please send us this information ASAP.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/15/2018 5:35:33 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Rodrick, Christian [rodrick.christian@epa.gov]; Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Will make sure you, and the committee staff, get it ASAP.

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 12:32 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA Budget Briefing

Aaron,

I understand that that information pertaining to the EPA budget briefing on February 21st was sent out yesterday. The Science Committee has still not received any information on this briefing. Please send us this information ASAP.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/15/2018 5:32:26 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]
Subject: EPA Budget Briefing

Aaron,

I understand that that information pertaining to the EPA budget briefing on February 21st was sent out yesterday. The Science Committee has still not received any information on this briefing. Please send us this information ASAP.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Woodward, Cheryl [Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/8/2018 5:22:57 PM
To: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Meeting

Do you have the information below Gina for the parking passes?

When arriving by car, I will arrange for parking at EPA Courtyard and meet you at your car to escort. Information needed to park in EPA Courtyard:

Arrival date/time
Driver/Car Description (color/make/tag)
Attendees in car

From: Finke, Gina [mailto:Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Woodward, Cheryl <Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Great! Mark Marin, Chief of Staff for the Science Committee, and Joe Brazauskas, Staff Director for the Environment Subcommittee will join the Chairman. Will there be parking?

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:27 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Woodward, Cheryl <Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Let's do 11am at the EPA on Jan 9. Can you let me know if anyone else will be attending with the Chairman?

I've copied Cheryl Woodward on this message. She will send you arrival details. She is out through Friday, so it may be Monday morning.

Thank you!

Hayley Ford
Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
ford.hayley@epa.gov

Phone: 202-564-2022
Cell: 202-306-6296

From: Finke, Gina [<mailto:Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:19 PM
To: Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Hayley --

Rep Smith has availability 1/9 in the morning around 11am, if that would work for Administrator Pruitt (Rep Smith could come to EPA; and he already has a lunch scheduled that day). If Administrator Pruitt's preference is lunch, Rep Smith could do the following week, 1/17. Let me know if either option works well on your end!

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-Z1

From: Ford, Hayley [<mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 12:58 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Gina and Joe,

Administrator Pruitt could do lunch with Chairman Smith on Jan 9. Would that work? We are flexible on timing. Could we do someplace centrally located between the EPA and the Hill?

Thanks!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
ford.hayley@epa.gov
Phone: 202-564-2022
Cell: 202-806-6296

From: "Brazauskas, Joseph" <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Date: January 3, 2018 at 11:57:02 AM EST
To: "Lyons, Troy" <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Finke, Gina" <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Meeting

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finkler to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Woodward, Cheryl [Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/8/2018 1:27:25 PM
To: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Meeting

My name is Cheryl Woodward, the point of contact for logistic at EPA. Your meeting with Administrator Pruitt on Tuesday, January 9 at 11 am is confirmed. The instruction/direction is below. If you have any questions, please contact me. Look forward to seeing you.

Directions: EPA address is 1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW. If you are coming by taxi/vehicle, you want to be dropped off on 12th Street NW, between Pennsylvania and Constitution Avenue. It is almost exactly half way between the two avenues on with Federal Triangle Metro sign and Trump Hotel Towers across street is a landmark. From 12th Street, facing the building with the EPA and American flags, walk toward the building (under the flags) and take the glass door on your left hand side with the escalators going down to the metro on your left. This is the South Lobby entrance to the William Jefferson Clinton building.

Once inside the building, security will prompt you to scan all items such as bags, coats etc., and then let the guards know that you were instructed to call Cheryl Woodward at 564-1274 or Hayley Ford at 564-2022 to escort you to the meeting with the Administrator. Security will have the visitors passes for everyone. Allow for 10 minutes to get through the process.

When arriving by car, I will arrange for parking at EPA Courtyard and meet you at your car. Information needed to park in EPA Courtyard:

Arrival date/time
Driver/Car Description (color/make/tag)
Attendees in car

The VIP vehicles are cleared to park in the building's courtyard which can be accessed from the SW corner of Pennsylvania Ave and 12th Street NW. The driveway is marked by a guard booth on 12th Street just south of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The delegation will be met by Ms. Cheryl Woodward/Protective Security Detail, in the building courtyard, to greet and escort VIPs and delegation to the meeting room. Ms. Woodward's contact number is 202-564-1274 and mobile number is 202-213-8593, if needed.

From: Ford, Hayley
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:27 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Woodward, Cheryl <Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Let's do 11am at the EPA on Jan 9. Can you let me know if anyone else will be attending with the Chairman?

I've copied Cheryl Woodward on this message. She will send you arrival details. She is out through Friday, so it may be Monday morning.

Thank you!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov

Phone: 202-564-2022

Cell: 202-896-6296

From: Finke, Gina [<mailto:Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:19 PM

To: Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>

Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>

Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Hayley –

Rep Smith has availability 1/9 in the morning around 11am, if that would work for Administrator Pruitt (Rep Smith could come to EPA; and he already has a lunch scheduled that day). If Administrator Pruitt's preference is lunch, Rep Smith could do the following week, 1/17. Let me know if either option works well on your end!

Gina Finke

Executive Assistant

Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [<mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 12:58 PM

To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>

Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Gina and Joe,

Administrator Pruitt could do lunch with Chairman Smith on Jan 9. Would that work? We are flexible on timing. Could we do someplace centrally located between the EPA and the Hill?

Thanks!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov

Phone: 202-564-2022

Cell: 202-896-6296

From: "Brazauskas, Joseph" <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>

Date: January 3, 2018 at 11:57:02 AM EST

To: "Lyons, Troy" <lyons.troy@epa.gov>

Cc: "Finke, Gina" <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>

Subject: Meeting

Troy,

ED_002397_00000014

ED_002607_00001426

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Ford, Hayley [ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/4/2018 10:38:05 PM
To: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Woodward, Cheryl [Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Meeting

Yes, if you need to park, we can arrange for you to park in our Courtyard. Cheryl will send those details.

Thank you!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
ford.hayley@epa.gov
Phone: 202-564-2022
Cell: 202-306-1296

From: Finke, Gina [mailto:Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 4:02 PM
To: Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Woodward, Cheryl <Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Great! Mark Marin, Chief of Staff for the Science Committee, and Joe Brazauskas, Staff Director for the Environment Subcommittee will join the Chairman. Will there be parking?

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:27 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Woodward, Cheryl <Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Let's do 11am at the EPA on Jan 9. Can you let me know if anyone else will be attending with the Chairman?

I've copied Cheryl Woodward on this message. She will send you arrival details. She is out through Friday, so it may be Monday morning.

Thank you!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov
Phone: 202-564-2022
Cell: 202-806-8296

From: Finke, Gina [<mailto:Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:19 PM
To: Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Hayley –

Rep Smith has availability 1/9 in the morning around 11am, if that would work for Administrator Pruitt (Rep Smith could come to EPA; and he already has a lunch scheduled that day). If Administrator Pruitt's preference is lunch, Rep Smith could do the following week, 1/17. Let me know if either option works well on your end!

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [<mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 12:58 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Gina and Joe,

Administrator Pruitt could do lunch with Chairman Smith on Jan 9. Would that work? We are flexible on timing. Could we do someplace centrally located between the EPA and the Hill?

Thanks!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov
Phone: 202-564-2022
Cell: 202-806-8296

From: "Brazauskas, Joseph" <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Date: January 3, 2018 at 11:57:02 AM EST
To: "Lyons, Troy" <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Finke, Gina" <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Meeting

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-4637

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/4/2018 9:02:25 PM
To: Ford, Hayley [ford.hayley@epa.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Woodward, Cheryl [Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Meeting

Great! Mark Marin, Chief of Staff for the Science Committee, and Joe Brazauskas, Staff Director for the Environment Subcommittee will join the Chairman. Will there be parking?

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:27 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Woodward, Cheryl <Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Let's do 11am at the EPA on Jan 9. Can you let me know if anyone else will be attending with the Chairman?

I've copied Cheryl Woodward on this message. She will send you arrival details. She is out through Friday, so it may be Monday morning.

Thank you!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
ford.hayley@epa.gov
Phone: 202-564-2022
Cell: 202-566-6296

From: Finke, Gina [mailto:Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:19 PM
To: Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Hayley

Rep Smith has availability 1/9 in the morning around 11am, if that would work for Administrator Pruitt (Rep Smith could come to EPA; and he already has a lunch scheduled that day). If Administrator Pruitt's preference is lunch, Rep Smith could do the following week, 1/17. Let me know if either option works well on your end!

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 12:58 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Gina and Joe,

Administrator Pruitt could do lunch with Chairman Smith on Jan 9. Would that work? We are flexible on timing. Could we do someplace centrally located between the EPA and the Hill?

Thanks!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov

Phone: 202-564-2022

Cell: 202-806-8296

From: "Brazauskas, Joseph" <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Date: January 3, 2018 at 11:57:02 AM EST
To: "Lyons, Troy" <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Finke, Gina" <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Meeting

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Ford, Hayley [ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/4/2018 8:26:35 PM
To: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Woodward, Cheryl [Woodward.Cheryl@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Meeting

Let's do 11am at the EPA on Jan 9. Can you let me know if anyone else will be attending with the Chairman?

I've copied Cheryl Woodward on this message. She will send you arrival details. She is out through Friday, so it may be Monday morning.

Thank you!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov

Phone: 202-564-2022

Cell: 202-886-1096

From: Finke, Gina [mailto:Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 3:19 PM
To: Ford, Hayley <ford.hayley@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Hayley --

Rep Smith has availability 1/9 in the morning around 11am, if that would work for Administrator Pruitt (Rep Smith could come to EPA; and he already has a lunch scheduled that day). If Administrator Pruitt's preference is lunch, Rep Smith could do the following week, 1/17. Let me know if either option works well on your end!

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 12:58 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Gina and Joe,

Administrator Pruitt could do lunch with Chairman Smith on Jan 9. Would that work? We are flexible on timing. Could we do someplace centrally located between the EPA and the Hill?

Thanks!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov

Phone: 202-564-2022

Cell: 202-366-8296

From: "Brazauskas, Joseph" <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Date: January 3, 2018 at 11:57:02 AM EST
To: "Lyons, Troy" <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Finke, Gina" <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Meeting

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/4/2018 8:18:52 PM
To: Ford, Hayley [ford.hayley@epa.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Hayley --

Rep Smith has availability 1/9 in the morning around 11am, if that would work for Administrator Pruitt (Rep Smith could come to EPA; and he already has a lunch scheduled that day). If Administrator Pruitt's preference is lunch, Rep Smith could do the following week, 1/17. Let me know if either option works well on your end!

Gina Finke
Executive Assistant
Rep. Lamar Smith TX-21

From: Ford, Hayley [mailto:ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2018 12:58 PM
To: Finke, Gina <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Gina and Joe,

Administrator Pruitt could do lunch with Chairman Smith on Jan 9. Would that work? We are flexible on timing. Could we do someplace centrally located between the EPA and the Hill?

Thanks!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency
ford.hayley@epa.gov
Phone: 202-564-2022
Cell: 202-306-4296

From: "Brazauskas, Joseph" <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Date: January 3, 2018 at 11:57:02 AM EST
To: "Lyons, Troy" <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Finke, Gina" <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Meeting

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,

Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Ford, Hayley [ford.hayley@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/4/2018 5:57:56 PM
To: Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov
Subject: RE: Meeting

Hi Gina and Joe,

Administrator Pruitt could do lunch with Chairman Smith on Jan 9. Would that work? We are flexible on timing. Could we do someplace centrally located between the EPA and the Hill?

Thanks!

Hayley Ford

Deputy White House Liaison and Personal Aide to the Administrator
Environmental Protection Agency

ford.hayley@epa.gov

Phone: 202-564-2022

Cell: 202-806-1296

From: "Brazauskas, Joseph" <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Date: January 3, 2018 at 11:57:02 AM EST
To: "Lyons, Troy" <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Cc: "Finke, Gina" <Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Meeting

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: 202-565-371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/3/2018 4:57:02 PM
To: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]
CC: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]
Subject: Meeting

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

From: Lyons, Troy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=15E4881C95044AB49C6C35A0F5EEF67E-LYONS, TROY]
Sent: 1/26/2018 2:08:22 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: DRAFT

DRAFT

EPA Administrator Pruitt Upholds Due Process and the Rule of Law

EPA decides not to withdraw proposed Clean Water Act restrictions for Pebble Mine in Alaska's Bristol Bay watershed

WASHINGTON – After receiving more than one million comments from the public and consulting with tribal governments and other stakeholders, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has decided not to withdraw the July 2014 Clean Water Act Proposed Determination for the development of a copper and gold mine at the Pebble deposit in Alaska's Bristol Bay watershed.

"Today's decision first and foremost upholds the rule of law and due process," said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. "It gives all parties additional time to determine how best to move forward on the Pebble Mine after extensive environmental analysis, as required under the regular permitting process."

Today's decision means that the permit review process for Pebble Limited Partnership (PLP) will continue, while EPA continues to work with federal, state, and tribal partners.

In December 2017, the PLP submitted a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit application to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Army Corps) to develop a mine at the Pebble deposit. EPA stands ready to work closely with PLP, the Army Corps and other stakeholders on the review of this permit application, including the Army Corps' development of a robust Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed mine that will ensure the world-class fisheries in the Bristol Bay region are protected.

EPA will not move forward with any action toward finalizing the Proposed Determination until after May 11, 2021, or the Army Corps complete a final EIS for the mine project, whichever comes first. This is in line with commitments EPA made in a May 2017 settlement agreement resolving outstanding lawsuits between PLP and EPA. If after May 11, 2021 or after a final EIS for the Pebble Mine is issued, the Agency decides to finalize its Proposed Determination, it could impose restrictions on the discharge of dredged or fill material associated with development of the Pebble Mine in Alaska's Bristol Bay watershed.

Throughout the course of this process, EPA has consulted with federally recognized tribal governments of the Bristol Bay region and Alaska Native Corporations with lands in the Bristol Bay watershed. The public comment period and tribal consultation process also allowed EPA to hear directly from the public. EPA will continue working with these groups as this process moves forward.

Background

In 2014, EPA's Region 10 completed an assessment of the Bristol Bay watershed and issued a Clean Water Act Section 404(c) Proposed Determination to restrict discharges of dredge or fill material into the watershed from mining the Pebble deposit. Section 404 is the part of the Clean Water Act that governs the permit evaluation process for actions that discharge dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. This action was controversial because EPA has almost never exercised this authority before a permit application was filed with the Corps, and many felt it effectively blocked PLP from applying.

EPA agreed to initiate a process to propose to withdraw the Proposed Determination as part of a May 11, 2017 settlement agreement with PLP, whose subsidiaries own the mineral claims to the Pebble deposit. The agreement provides Pebble additional time to apply for a Clean Water Act 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers before EPA moves any further with its Clean Water Act Section 404(c) review. PLP has now filed its application with the Corps, and the Corps will review that application, with EPA's continuing advice.

Additional information: www.epa.gov/bristolbay

Troy M. Lyons

Associate Administrator

Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

202-306-8490 (cell)

Message

From: Lyons, Troy [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=15E4881C95044AB49C6C35A0F5EEF67E-LYONS, TROY]
Sent: 1/3/2018 11:31:12 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Finke, Gina [Gina.Finke@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Meeting

Thanks, Joel! Let me run this up the chain and get right back to you w a date

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 3, 2018, at 11:58 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Troy,

Good talking to you on the phone just now. The following days over the next month would work well for Chairman Smith: January 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 29, 30, 31. I have also cc'd the Chairman's schedule Gina Finker to put in touch with the Administrator's to work out the particulars.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Appointment

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/14/2018 10:18:59 PM
To: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Subject: House Science Glyphosate followup call on Studies
Location: call 202-891-6477 code 6332122 #
Start: 2/15/2018 3:30:00 PM
End: 2/15/2018 4:00:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

Appointment

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/26/2018 9:46:09 PM
To: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Rodrick, Christian [rodrick.christian@epa.gov]
Subject: House Science Hearing on Glyphosate
Location: Call 202-848-0477, code 63218
Start: 2/2/2018 6:30:00 PM
End: 2/2/2018 7:30:00 PM
Show Time As: Busy

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/26/2018 7:47:14 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Great thanks.

Kind Regards,

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Congressional Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 2:43 PM
To: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Thanks Christina, all of the Majority staff included on this email will be in attendance at the briefing. I will have to check with the Minority to see who they plan on sending.

As for the topics, most of us were in attendance last Friday and understand the general concepts but forward in EPA's strategic plan. We are most interested in how this strategic plan affects the offices and programs within the Office of Research and Development. Additionally, we would like more information on the FY 2019 Justification and how it pertains to the Science and Technology budget and more specifically the Office of Research and Development.

Best,
Joe

From: Moody, Christina [mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 1:52 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Time has been set aside for Thursday, March 8 @ 1pm at EPA.

I'll need a list of individuals who will be attending for security purposes, as well as the specific topics related to ORD's budget that you want to discuss.

Kind Regards,

Christina J. Moody

US Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Congressional Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

From: Ringel, Aaron
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 12:03 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Thanks Joe, looping in Christina to help coordinate schedules and lock in times to brief ya'll here at EPA HQ.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 26, 2018, at 11:54 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Good to see you at the Budget Symposium on Friday. As we discussed, the Committee requests a bipartisan staff level briefing to better understand the budget request as it pertains to the programs in the Science Committee's jurisdiction, specifically the Office of Research and Development. We are happy to accommodate EPA and attend this briefing at your office. We ask that you please schedule this briefing as soon as possible, we have a lot of flexibility the week of March 4th and at this time are available any morning except for Friday.

Please let us know what times work on your end.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 325-4371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/26/2018 7:43:17 PM
To: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
CC: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Thanks Christina, all of the Majority staff included on this email will be in attendance at the briefing. I will have to check with the Minority to see who they plan on sending.

As for the topics, most of us were in attendance last Friday and understand the general concepts but forward in EPA's strategic plan. We are most interested in how this strategic plan affects the offices and programs within the Office of Research and Development. Additionally, we would like more information on the FY 2019 Justification and how it pertains to the Science and Technology budget and more specifically the Office of Research and Development.

Best,
Joe

From: Moody, Christina [mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 1:52 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Time has been set aside for Thursday, March 8 @ 1pm at EPA.

I'll need a list of individuals who will be attending for security purposes, as well as the specific topics related to ORD's budget that you want to discuss.

Kind Regards,

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Congressional Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

From: Ringel, Aaron
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 12:03 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Thanks Joe, looping in Christina to help coordinate schedules and lock in times to brief ya'll here at EPA HQ.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 26, 2018, at 11:54 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Good to see you at the Budget Symposium on Friday. As we discussed, the Committee requests a bipartisan staff level briefing to better understand the budget request as it pertains to the programs in the Science Committee's jurisdiction, specifically the Office of Research and Development. We are happy to accommodate EPA and attend this briefing at your office. We ask that you please schedule this briefing as soon as possible, we have a lot of flexibility the week of March 4th and at this time are available any morning except for Friday.

Please let us know what times work on your end.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/26/2018 5:21:18 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Actually, in order to loop in the right folks, please narrow down for me the context of what you'd like to be briefed on. That would be incredibly helpful in having a productive conversation.

Thanks,

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Congressional Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

From: Ringel, Aaron
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 12:03 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Thanks Joe, looping in Christina to help coordinate schedules and lock in times to brief ya'll here at EPA HQ.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 26, 2018, at 11:54 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Good to see you at the Budget Symposium on Friday. As we discussed, the Committee requests a bipartisan staff level briefing to better understand the budget request as it pertains to the programs in the Science Committee's jurisdiction, specifically the Office of Research and Development. We are happy to accommodate EPA and attend this briefing at your office. We ask that you please schedule this briefing as soon as possible, we have a lot of flexibility the week of March 4th and at this time are available any morning except for Friday.

Please let us know what times work on your end.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/26/2018 5:19:22 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: ORD Budget Briefing Request

I'll be in touch.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Congressional Affairs & Intergovernmental Relations
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

From: Ringel, Aaron
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2018 12:03 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Thanks Joe, looping in Christina to help coordinate schedules and lock in times to brief ya'll here at EPA HQ.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 26, 2018, at 11:54 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Good to see you at the Budget Symposium on Friday. As we discussed, the Committee requests a bipartisan staff level briefing to better understand the budget request as it pertains to the programs in the Science Committee's jurisdiction, specifically the Office of Research and Development. We are happy to accommodate EPA and attend this briefing at your office. We ask that you please schedule this briefing as soon as possible, we have a lot of flexibility the week of March 4th and at this time are available any morning except for Friday.

Please let us know what times work on your end.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/26/2018 4:54:45 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]
Subject: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Flag: Follow up

Aaron,

Good to see you at the Budget Symposium on Friday. As we discussed, the Committee requests a bipartisan staff level briefing to better understand the budget request as it pertains to the programs in the Science Committee's jurisdiction, specifically the Office of Research and Development. We are happy to accommodate EPA and attend this briefing at your office. We ask that you please schedule this briefing as soon as possible, we have a lot of flexibility the week of March 4th and at this time are available any morning except for Friday.

Please let us know what times work on your end.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/4/2018 4:11:07 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
CC: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,
Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [<mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
[202-225-6371](tel:202-225-6371)

Message

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/23/2018 7:19:36 PM
To: Dziadon, Daniel [Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Rodrick, Christian [rodrick.christian@epa.gov]
Subject: House Science Hearing on Glyphosate - Transcript and QFR

Daniel – thanks for sending over the transcript and the QFR. We'll be glad to review and get back with any comments on the transcript and a response to the QFR. Please let me know if any additional questions. Best,
Sven

Sven-Erik Kaiser
U.S. EPA
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (1305A)
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2753 (o)
202-566-1919 (c)

From: Dziadon, Daniel [mailto:Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2018 2:13 PM
To: Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Hearing Invitation

Good afternoon,

On behalf of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I want to thank you for your appearance at the February 6, 2018 hearing, *"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review."* I have attached a verbatim transcript of the hearing for your review, as well as a thank you letter with additional questions for the record from Chairman Smith

Any transcript edits and answers to the questions for the record are due back by **Friday, March 9**. Please let me know if you have any questions!

Thank you again,
Daniel Dziadon

Daniel Dziadon
Policy Assistant | Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
Subcommittee on Energy | Subcommittee on Environment
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
202-566-5332

From: Dziadon, Daniel
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 3:44 PM
To: 'ringel.aaron@epa.gov' <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; 'kaiser.sven-erik@epa.gov' <kaiser.sven-erik@epa.gov>; 'lowit.anna@epa.gov' <lowit.anna@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Hearing Invitation

Good afternoon,

Please find attached your invitation to appear at the Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing titled, *"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review,"* on February 6, 2018.

Please let me know if you have any questions! We look forward to having you.

Best,
Daniel Dziadon

Daniel Dziadon
Policy Assistant | Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
Subcommittee on Energy | Subcommittee on Environment
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

[202] EX-371

Message

From: Dziadon, Daniel [Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/23/2018 7:13:28 PM
To: Lowit, Anna [Lowit.Anna@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
CC: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Hearing Invitation
Attachments: 02_23_18 CLS - Dr. Lowit Thank You, QFR.pdf; Transcript.pdf

Good afternoon,

On behalf of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I want to thank you for your appearance at the February 6, 2018 hearing, *"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review."* I have attached a verbatim transcript of the hearing for your review, as well as a thank you letter with additional questions for the record from Chairman Smith

Any transcript edits and answers to the questions for the record are due back by **Friday, March 9**. Please let me know if you have any questions!

Thank you again,
Daniel Dziadon

Daniel Dziadon
Policy Assistant | Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
Subcommittee on Energy | Subcommittee on Environment
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

(202) Ex: 6371

From: Dziadon, Daniel
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 3:44 PM
To: 'ringel.aaron@epa.gov' <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; 'kaiser.sven-erik@epa.gov' <kaiser.sven-erik@epa.gov>; 'lowit.anna@epa.gov' <lowit.anna@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Hearing Invitation

Good afternoon,

Please find attached your invitation to appear at the Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing titled, *"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review,"* on February 6, 2018.

Please let me know if you have any questions! We look forward to having you.

Best,
Daniel Dziadon

Daniel Dziadon
Policy Assistant | Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
Subcommittee on Energy | Subcommittee on Environment
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

(202) Ex: 6371

Not for Public Distribution

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

2321 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6301

(202) 225-6371

www.science.house.gov

February 23, 2018

Dr. Anna Lowit
Senior Science Advisor
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Dr. Lowit,

On behalf of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, I want to express my appreciation for your participation in the February 6, 2018, hearing titled, "*In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review*."

I have attached a verbatim transcript of the hearing for your review. The Committee's policy pertaining to the printing of transcripts is as follows:

The transcripts of those hearings conducted by the Committee shall be published as a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved. Individuals whose comments are to be published as part of a Committee document shall be given the opportunity to verify the accuracy of the transcription in advance of publication.

Transcript edits, if any, should be submitted no later than March 9, 2018. If no edits are received by the above date, I will presume that you have no suggested edits to the transcript.

I am also enclosing questions submitted for the record by Members of the Committee. These are questions that the Members were unable to pursue during the time allotted at the hearing, but felt were important to address as part of the official record. **All of the enclosed questions must be responded to no later than March 9, 2018.**

All transcript edits and responses to the enclosed questions should be submitted to me and directed to the attention of Daniel Dziadon at daniel.dziadon@mail.house.gov. If you have any further questions or concerns, please contact Mr. Dziadon at (202) 225-6371.

Thank you again for your testimony.

Sincerely,



Lamar Smith
Chairman

cc: Eddie Bernice Johnson
Ranking Member

Enclosures: Transcript, Member Questions for the Record

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review"

Dr. Anna Lowit, Senior Science Advisor, Office of Pesticide Programs, U.S.
Environmental Protection Agency

Question submitted by Rep. Lamar Smith, Chairman,
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology

Dr. Sass noted the importance of EPA protecting all populations from health risks posed by chemicals, implying that EPA does not do this.

1. *Does EPA consider risks to sensitive subpopulations, including children, when it conducts pesticide risk assessments and determines allowable exposures?*

STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES
Unrevised and Unedited
Not for Quotation or
Duplication

**IN DEFENSE OF SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY: EXAMINING THE IARC
MONOGRAPH PROGRAMME AND GLYPHOSATE REVIEW**

Tuesday, February 6, 2018

House of Representatives,

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,

Washington, D.C.

Committee Hearings

of the

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



OFFICE OF THE CLERK
Office of Official Reporters

1 YORK STENOGRAPHIC SERVICES, INC.
2 RPTS BROWN
3 HSY037.000

4 IN DEFENSE OF SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY: EXAMINING THE IARC
5 MONOGRAPH PROGRAMME AND GLYPHOSATE REVIEW
6 Tuesday, February 6, 2018
7 House of Representatives,
8 Committee on Science, Space, and Technology,
9 Washington, D.C.

10 The Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:06 a.m., in
11 Room 2318 of the Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Lamar
12 Smith [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

13 Chairman SMITH. The Committee on Science, Space, and
14 Technology will come to order. Without objection, the Chair
15 is authorized to declare recesses of the Committee at any
16 time.

17 Welcome to today's hearing entitled "'In Defense of
18 Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme
19 and Glyphosate Review.'"

20 I recognize myself for 5 minutes for an opening
21 statement, and then I'll recognize the opening--I mean the
22 Ranking Member as well.

23 Today, we will examine the U.S. taxpayer-funded IARC
24 Monograph Programme and its assessment of the herbicide
25 glyphosate, more commonly known as Roundup. We must ensure
26 that the underlying science behind assessments that influence
27 policy and the public is based on sound science. The
28 American people deserve to know the truth about which
29 substances are safe and which ones pose a risk. Glyphosate
30 is the most widely used herbicide in the world. Americans
31 and people across the globe rely on these crops for high
32 quality, affordable food.

33 There are real repercussions to IARC's unsubstantiated
34 claims, which are not backed by reliable data. Labeling
35 requirements will drive costs up for farmers and consumers
36 and create unjustified public fear. IARC's irresponsible
37 handling of data does real harm to job creators and the

38 public's view of the scientific process.

39 Agencies such as IARC have a responsibility to adhere to
40 the scientific method and evaluate all relevant scientific
41 studies, weigh the evidence, and come to a conclusion that
42 can be reproduced. Following the scientific method also
43 means forming a conclusion only after all data has been
44 considered.

45 According to information gathered by the Committee,
46 there appear to be serious problems with the science
47 underlying IARC's assessment of glyphosate. The news media
48 recently revealed evidence of data deletion and manipulation
49 of draft assessments before final publication. IARC's
50 conclusion about glyphosate relied only on data that was
51 favorable to its conclusion and ignored contradictory data.

52 In its assessment, IARC did no direct evaluation of
53 glyphosate's effect on humans, no evaluation whatsoever.
54 Specifically, IARC appears to have intentionally omitted data
55 that showed glyphosate does not cause cancer. It's no
56 surprise that the Monograph Programme has refused to publish
57 any of its draft assessments. If there is nothing to hide,
58 why the secrecy?

59 The manipulation of scientific data and lack of
60 transparency is not the only defect in IARC's glyphosate
61 assessment. Besides altering the data used in the
62 assessment, the Monograph Working Group failed to consider

63 the most significant study on human exposure to glyphosate.
64 The Agricultural Health Study, which was a result of a
65 collaboration of several federal agencies such as the
66 National Cancer Institute, National Institute of
67 Environmental Health Sciences, and the Environmental
68 Protection Agency presented information they had collected on
69 over 50,000 humans. Aaron Blair, the Chair of the Monograph
70 Programme at the time, admitted in a deposition that the
71 study would, quote, "altered IARC's analysis," end quote.
72 However, this study was not considered by IARC.

73 In 2015, IARC published its findings on glyphosate,
74 categorizing the herbicide as "probably" causing cancer.
75 It has become apparent that the Monograph on glyphosate uses
76 nothing more than cherry-picked science created by those who
77 have a financial stake in the resulting conclusions.

78 The Monograph Programme is alone in its determination
79 that glyphosate poses a cancer threat. Both the EPA and
80 EFSA, a European regulatory agency, have reviewed glyphosate
81 and determined that the chemical is unlikely to cause cancer.

82 Last December, the EPA released a draft Human Health Risk
83 Assessment evaluating the potential of glyphosate to cause
84 cancer. The EPA body of research was then evaluated by a
85 Scientific Advisory Panel composed of experts appointed
86 during the Obama Administration. The EPA's draft assessment
87 reviewed IARC's glyphosate Monograph and came to the

88 conclusion that glyphosate is unlikely to cause cancer.

89 The Committee has written several letters expressing
90 concerns about the lack of sound science and biases found in
91 IARC's program. When asked to provide a witness for this
92 hearing, IARC Director Wild refused to attend. No doubt he
93 could not defend IARC's glyphosate findings. The selective
94 use of data and the lack of public disclosure raise questions
95 about why IARC should receive any government funding in the
96 future.

97 [The statement of Chairman Smith follows:]

98 ***** INSERT 1 *****

99 Chairman SMITH. That concludes my opening statement,
100 and the Ranking Member, the gentlewoman from Texas, is
101 recognize for hers.

102 Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

103 Chemicals have the potential to greatly improve our
104 quality of life when developed and produced in a responsible
105 manner. However, when produced or proliferated irresponsibly
106 or without sufficient understanding of their potential
107 impacts, chemicals can pose a grave and significant risk to
108 every one of us.

109 Unfortunately, by the time we realize the harm being
110 caused by unsafe exposure to such toxic chemicals, the damage
111 has often already been done, and we're left regretting the
112 fact that there might have been preventative actions we could
113 have taken to protect ourselves if we had a better
114 understanding of the hazards. If we knew then what we know
115 now, would we have filled our homes, schools, businesses,
116 hospitals with asbestos? Would we have supported the
117 widespread installation of lead pipes to provide us with our
118 daily drinking water? Most Americans who have had to suffer
119 or who have seen their children and other loved ones suffer
120 through the adverse health effects of exposures to dangerous
121 chemicals would likely say no, of course not.

122 The chemicals we are discussing today--glyphosate--is
123 also already one of the most widely used chemicals in

124 agriculture. For example, it is the key ingredient in
125 Monsanto's herbicide Roundup that has helped farmers get
126 greater yield of corn and other agriculture products.
127 However, the widespread prevalence of glyphosate has raised
128 serious concerns about its toxicity and potential
129 cancer-causing properties.

130 That is why the work done by independent chemical
131 assessment organizations like the World Health Organization
132 and its International Agency for Research on Cancer is so
133 critical to protecting the public health of--those
134 organizations evaluate without prejudice or concern about
135 profits, the health habits--hazards and risks posed by
136 exposure to toxic chemicals. By contrast, there's been
137 extensive documentation of efforts by the chemical industry
138 to bias the science and public perception of their chemicals
139 to protect their financial interests rather than the public
140 health. If we are truly interested in defending scientific
141 integrity, we should be doing more than simply hearing from
142 the industry-friendly scientists.

143 As my colleagues may be aware, the EPA's Office of
144 Inspector General has been investigating allegations that
145 Monsanto attempted to influence officials at the
146 Environmental Protection Agency who were central to EPA's own
147 review of glyphosate, as well as potential collusion by those
148 officials with Monsanto. If this committee really wishes to

149 do oversight in defense of scientific integrity, those
150 allegations would certainly seem to be worthy of our
151 attention. However, I am not holding my breath that the
152 majority will undertake such an investigation.

153 Mr. Chairman, chemical companies will continue to
154 innovate and manufacture chemicals that seek to improve human
155 life, and I support their initiatives in doing so. But such
156 innovations should not come at the cost of human health.
157 That is why the work of independent organizations like IARC
158 is so important and why we in Congress should be supporting
159 that work rather than attempting to undercut it.

160 The minority staff has produced a staff report that
161 documents some of the tactics Monsanto has used to undermine
162 this IARC Monograph and scientific findings and glyphosate in
163 general, and I'm attaching this report to my statement.

164 I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield back.

165 [The statement of Ms. Johnson follows:]

166 ***** INSERTS 2, 3 *****

167 Chairman SMITH. Okay. Thank you, Ms. Johnson.

168 Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman?

169 Chairman SMITH. Yes, the gentleman from Texas, Mr.
170 Weber.

171 Mr. WEBER. If I may, I have reservations about entering
172 this report into the record. This committee received the
173 minority's report--staff report late last night and has not
174 had sufficient time to completely review this report for
175 factual accuracy. I am aware at this time--

176 Ms. JOHNSON. I didn't--oh, sorry.

177 Mr. WEBER. --of at least one statement of questionable
178 accuracy. It's on page 15 and 16. The minority's report
179 appears to suggest that the current EPA Administrator Mr.
180 Scott Pruitt was somehow involved in the December 2016
181 decision to remove Dr. Peter Infante from EPA's Science
182 Advisory Panel to review glyphosate. Mr. Chairman, Dr.
183 Infante was removed during the SAP during President--from the
184 SAP during President Obama's term while Gina McCarthy was the
185 Administrator. And since Greg Pruitt was sworn in February
186 17, 2017, there really is no rational basis to justify this
187 claim. So I hope the minority will be able to explain that
188 statement.

189 I yield, Mr. Chairman.

190 Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Weber.

191 Ms. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman?

192 Chairman SMITH. And the gentlewoman from Texas is
193 recognized.

194 Ms. JOHNSON. I did not request unanimous consent. I
195 simply said I will be attaching the report to my statement.

196 Chairman SMITH. I think Mr. Weber's point was that it
197 contained something that was not accurate and not factual and
198 we hope you'll take a look at that.

199 Ms. JOHNSON. I hope everyone will take a look at it.

200 Chairman SMITH. Okay. Well, Mr. Weber went into some
201 detail as to what was inaccurate, and we'll look forward to
202 your response later on. Thank you, Ms. Johnson. Thank you,
203 Mr. Weber.

204 The gentleman from Oklahoma, the Vice Chairman of the
205 Committee, Mr. Lucas, is recognized for an opening statement.

206 Mr. LUCAS. Thank you, Chairman Smith, for holding this
207 hearing on the important topic of scientific integrity of the
208 International Agency for Research on Cancer's Monograph
209 Programme. I look forward to hearing from our panel of
210 expert witnesses this morning and want to thank them for
211 their voluntary appearance before this committee.

212 First recognized by the World Health Organization in
213 1965, IARC began as a French initiative to find and root out
214 cancer both in France and around the world. In pursuit of
215 this goal, one of IARC's many endeavors was the

216 identification and classification of known carcinogens. This
217 has come to be known as the Monograph Programme. While the
218 effort at the time represented the best modern understanding
219 of cancer and the environmental causes, the methods of IARC's
220 Monograph Programme have remained largely unchanged over the
221 years, even as our understanding of cancer has evolved.

222 This has caused IARC to reach conclusions that not only
223 create unnecessary fear in people, but in some cases causes
224 IARC to reach conclusions that are contradictions to the best
225 available science. This is unfortunate in any scientific
226 program but is completely unacceptable in one in which the
227 United States, through the NIH and through NIEHS, provides
228 the majority of the funding. This is even more true when
229 IARC's conclusions are then utilized as the basis of
230 regulations, for instance, in places such as California of
231 products like Roundup that contain glyphosate.

232 In 2015, the IARC Monograph Programme categorized
233 glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic to humans." As
234 Chairman Smith explained, IARC's glyphosate Monograph
235 contained substantial portions of alterations and deletions,
236 it appears, to aid the Monograph in drawing a particular
237 conclusion.

238 While the appearance of agenda-driven manipulation is
239 troubling on its own, it's even more so when considering that
240 IARC's final conclusion is not only on the fringe of the

241 scientific world but is completely and totally by itself.
242 The respected scientific bodies such as the Environmental
243 Protection Agency, the European Food Safety Agency, or IARC's
244 own parent body, the WHO, has repeatedly found there to be no
245 risk posed to humans when glyphosate is used as directed.
246 Yet, the IARC Monograph Program persists, reviewing and
247 labeling over 900 substances as 'possible' or 'probable'
248 carcinogens over the last 40-plus years, while the only
249 labeling--only labeling one as noncarcinogenic.

250 IARC's explanation for all this is that they simply
251 assess hazard and not risk; therefore, the actual probability
252 that these substances cause cancer cannot be gleaned from
253 their Monographs. If left unchallenged, this would excuse
254 IARC's bad behavior and give a de facto blessing to their
255 refusal to bring their scientific methods into the modern
256 age. This kind of shoddy work is unacceptable from any
257 scientific body, let alone one funded by the American
258 taxpayer.

259 The modern agricultural revolution, of which glyphosate
260 and other IARC-labeled 'carcinogenic' herbicides have
261 played an enormous role, has helped feed the world and
262 enabled struggling nations to grow and gain a footing on the
263 world stage. All of this, however, is threatened by IARC's
264 flawed scientific analysis. Far too often, farmers,
265 ranchers, and small businesses find themselves on the

266 receiving end of burdensome regulations like those that stem
267 from IARC's misleading assessments. We should be working to
268 reduce the burdens of these hardworking Americans, not
269 funding the growth of them.

270 And when a federal or international agency makes
271 decisions that have the potential to directly and negatively
272 impact American citizens, we in Congress have a duty to ask
273 questions to address the concerns of our constituents.
274 Similarly, when a federal or international agency utilizes
275 American tax dollars to reach conclusions that directly
276 contradict the overwhelming majority of scientific knowledge,
277 we have a duty to ask how they came to that conclusion.

278 This committee has, on several occasions, attempted to
279 gain a greater understanding of IARC's decision-making
280 process. Unfortunately, the Committee's simple request for
281 IARC to provide a witness to testify on the Monograph
282 Programme has been met with resistance. The pursuit of an
283 awesome goal like the eradication of cancer should not,
284 cannot, prevent us from asking questions regarding the
285 processes and methods utilized to reach a certain conclusion.

286 Simply because an organization has a commendable goal
287 should never mean the conclusions it draws are beyond
288 reproach.

289 I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today not
290 only about the problems in the methods and procedures of the

291 IARC Monograph Programme, of which there are many, but also
292 about the fixes they believe that can be made to bring the
293 Monograph Programme back into line with modern science.

294 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of
295 my time.

296 [The statement of Mr. Lucas follows:]

297 ***** INSERT 4 *****

298 Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Lucas.

299 And the gentlewoman from Oregon, the Ranking Member of
300 the Environmental Subcommittee, is recognized for her
301 statement.

302 Ms. BONAMICI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm glad we're
303 having this hearing today about the chemical review process.

304 Ranking Member Johnson is correct. For too long
305 industries' influence on this process as endangered the
306 public's health and safety. Today, there is an assault on
307 independent scientists and independent scientific
308 organizations by the Trump Administration particularly by the
309 Environmental Protection Agency. It is important that we
310 review the methods and tactics that industry has used it to
311 influence this Administration and attack independent
312 scientific organizations like the World Health Organization's
313 International Agency for Research on Cancer or IARC.

314 This hearing today will focus on IARC's hazard
315 assessment of glyphosate, a key ingredient in Monsanto's
316 Roundup broad-spectrum herbicide used to kill weeds and
317 grasses. In 2015, IARC determined that glyphosate was
318 probably carcinogenic to humans. Other reviews, including a
319 draft Human Health Risk Assessment released by the EPA in
320 December, concluded that glyphosate is not likely to be
321 carcinogenic to humans. Part of that discrepancy may be

322 because these reviews have investigated different issues.

323 IARC conducts hazard assessments while EPA conducts risk
324 assessments. According to IARC, a cancer hazard is an agent
325 that is capable of causing cancer under some circumstances
326 while a cancer risk is an estimate of the carcinogenic
327 effects expected from exposure to a cancer hazard. Although
328 there seems to be some confusion about these distinct
329 scientific procedures of analysis and the science on this
330 issue still appears unsettled, the attacks by the chemical
331 industry to discredit individual scientists and scientific
332 organizations such as IARC is not.

333 Internal Monsanto records show that company employees
334 have ghostwritten scientific journal articles on glyphosate,
335 attempted to orchestrate a public outcry over IARC's
336 glyphosate findings, and have targeted specific independent
337 scientists for attack. At a time when most of us are
338 sensitive to the cries of fake news the Monsanto records show
339 in their own words that they have sought to amplify positive
340 messages about glyphosate on social media, neutralize the
341 impact of the IARC decision on glyphosate, and to use
342 industry front groups as a platform for IARC observers and
343 industry spokespersons.

344 Attempts by industry to mischaracterize the scientific
345 debate appear intended to undercut the scientific evidence
346 regarding the possible dangers of glyphosate and its

347 potential impact on human health. We must make sure any
348 chemical review is not undone by undue corporate influence or
349 misleading scientific studies.

350 This is all the more important when the chemicals under
351 review are so widely used. Glyphosate has been used as an
352 herbicide in the United States since 1974, and its use in the
353 United States has grown from 11 million pounds in 1987 to
354 nearly 300 million pounds in 2016. Since its introduction in
355 the United States 1.8 million tons of glyphosate have been
356 applied across the country, and 9.4 million tons of
357 glyphosate has been used on crops around the world. Recent
358 studies have shown that this widescale use of glyphosate has
359 had an impact on our food supplies and communities.
360 Glyphosate has been detected in crackers, cookies, cereals,
361 as well as in organic honey and oatmeal.

362 Chemical exposures, just like exposures to asbestos or
363 lead or other potentially toxic substances, occur regardless
364 of whether we sit on the left or the right of a particular
365 political issue. The public health implications of these
366 exposures are felt by all Americans and all people. That is
367 exactly why an independent scientific review that is not
368 unfairly or surreptitiously influenced by industry is
369 necessary. We need to come to conclusions regarding the
370 scientific evidence concerning glyphosate's potential impact
371 on human health in a transparent and complete manner.

372 I look forward to hearing the testimony of our witnesses
373 today, and I'm glad Dr. Jennifer Sass from the Natural
374 Resources Defense Council is here. More than 6 years ago,
375 Dr. Sass wrote a report titled ''The Delay Game: How the
376 Chemical Industry Ducks Regulation of the Most Toxic
377 Substances.'' It's important that the Committee hear her
378 perspective on these issues.

379 [The statement of Ms. Bonamici follows:]

380 ***** INSERT 5 *****

381 Ms. BONAMICI. And before I yield back, Mr. Chairman, I
382 have three responses from Dr. Christopher Wild, the Director
383 of IARC, responding to inquiries you made late last year. In
384 summary, Dr. Wild provides factually supported rebuttals to
385 criticisms you and others have made about the IARC glyphosate
386 Monograph, and I ask that these documents be made part of the
387 record.

388 Chairman SMITH. Without objection.

389 [The information follows:]

390 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

391 Ms. BONAMICI. And I yield back the balance of my time.
392 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

393 Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Ms. Bonamici. And I'll
394 introduce our witnesses now. Our first witness today is Dr.
395 Anna Lowit, Senior Science Advisor in the Office of Pesticide
396 Programs at the Environmental Protection Agency. Dr. Lowit
397 has been a toxicologist in OPP's Health Effects Division
398 since 1998. During this time, she has provided expert
399 technical advice and guidance on issues related to toxicity,
400 testing human risk assessment, and science policy issues.
401 She was elected co-Chair of the Interagency Coordinating
402 Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods, a
403 committee of representatives from 16 federal agencies that
404 require, generate, or disseminate toxicological and safety
405 testing information. In January, she was named the recipient
406 of the Society of Toxicology's 2018 Enhancement of Animal
407 Welfare Award. Dr. Lowit received her master's of science
408 and Ph.D. in environmental toxicology from the University of
409 Tennessee.

410 Our next witness is Dr. Timothy Pastoor, CEO of Pastoor
411 Science Communications. In addition, he is President of the
412 Health and Environmental Science Institute, a D.C.-based
413 nonprofit organization. With over 30 years of international
414 experience, Dr. Pastoor has been involved with fundamental
415 toxicity testing, mode-of-action research, and Human Health

416 Risk Assessment. For the majority of his career, he led
417 toxicology and risk assessment experts in the conduct of
418 safety, health, and environmental studies to assess risk to
419 humans and the environment. He retired in 2015 and founded
420 the company Pastoor Science Communications, LLC, centered
421 around his passion for advancing sound science. Dr. Pastoor
422 received a Ph.D. in toxicology from the University of
423 Michigan.

424 Our third witness is Dr. Jennifer Sass, Senior Scientist
425 at the Natural Resources Defense Council. She is also a
426 professorial lecturer in the Environmental and Occupational
427 Health Department at George Washington University. In her
428 work with the NRDC, Dr. Sass brings a highly specialized
429 expertise in U.S. chemicals policy. She has published
430 peer-reviewed journals on the regulation of toxic chemicals
431 and emerging contaminants such as nanomaterials. Dr. Sass
432 earned a master's degree and a Ph.D. in anatomy and cell
433 biology from the University of Saskatchewan Canada and has
434 done postdoctoral work in toxicology at the University of
435 Maryland.

436 Our final witness today is Dr. Robert Tarone, a
437 Biostatistics Director at the International Epidemiology
438 Institute for 14 years before retiring in 2016. Previously,
439 he was a mathematical statistician at the U.S. National
440 Cancer Institute and a professor in the Department of

441 Medicine at Vanderbilt University. During his career, Dr.
442 Tarone has provided statistical assistance to a wide variety
443 of laboratory and clinical researchers, including
444 investigators in the field of immunology, DNA repair, and
445 cancer-prone inherited diseases. He received his bachelor of
446 science, master's of arts, and Ph.D. all in mathematics from
447 the University of California Davis.

448 We recognize and appreciate and welcome you all. And,
449 Dr. Lowit, if you will begin.

450 STATEMENTS OF ANNA LOWIT, SENIOR SCIENCE ADVISOR, OFFICE OF
451 PESTICIDE PROGRAMS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; TIMOTHY
452 PASTOOR, CEO, PASTOOR SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS; JENNIFER SASS,
453 SENIOR SCIENTIST, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; AND
454 ROBERT TARONE, MATHEMATICAL STATISTICIAN, U.S. NATIONAL
455 CANCER INSTITUTE, AND BIOSTATISTICS DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL
456 EPIDEMIOLOGY INSTITUTE

457 STATEMENT OF ANNA LOWIT

458 Ms. LOWIT. Good morning, Chairman Smith, Ranking
459 Member Johnson, and the rest of the members of the committee.
460 My name is Anna Lowit. I serve as a Science Advisor for
461 EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs. I have a Ph.D. in
462 environmental toxicology and have worked in the area of
463 pesticide risk assessment and toxicology for nearly 20 years.

464 EPA regulates the manufacture and use of all pesticides
465 in the United States and establishes maximum levels for
466 pesticide residues in food, safeguarding the Nation's food
467 supply, workers, and the general public.

468 In addition to evaluating new pesticides before they can
469 enter the market, EPA reevaluates existing pesticides at
470 least every 15 years under a program known as registration
471 review. EPA must complete registration review for more than

472 700 pesticides by October 1 of 2020. In 2017, EPA evaluated
473 more than 120 pesticides using the risk assessment process.

474 Glyphosate, commonly known as Roundup, was initially
475 registered by EPA in 1974. Glyphosate is one of the most
476 widely used herbicide in the United States with about 270
477 million pounds of active ingredient applied annually.
478 Glyphosate is used on a large number of crops, primarily corn
479 and soybean, and is commonly used by homeowners.

480 Registration review for glyphosate was initiated in 2009
481 using the statutory registration review process applied to
482 all registered pesticides. As part of this process, several
483 types of assessments have been initiated, including
484 evaluations of human health, ecological risk,
485 carcinogenicity, endocrine disruption, and risk to
486 pollinators. The assessments are subject to extensive
487 technical review and public comment throughout the review
488 process.

489 EPA released the draft Human Health and Ecological Risk
490 Assessments in December of 2017. Glyphosate is considered to
491 have little to no hazard when exposures to the skin or when
492 inhaled. Effects in laboratory animals were only seen
493 through ingestion at very high doses. In the case of
494 glyphosate, the Human Health Risk Assessment was developed
495 with conservative exposure assumptions. Even with these
496 conservative assumptions, no risk to humans, including

497 infants and children, were identified. This conclusion
498 showing no risk to humans is consistent with risk assessment
499 findings in other countries and by international
500 organizations such as Canada and the European Food Safety
501 Authority.

502 Glyphosate was also subject to endocrine screening.
503 Based on weight-of-evidence considerations, there's no
504 convincing evidence of potential interaction with estrogen,
505 androgen, or thyroid pathways, and no additional endocrine
506 related studies are considered necessary.

507 In 2016, EPA conducted a comprehensive analysis of all
508 the available laboratory animal carcinogenicity,
509 mutagenicity, and epidemiology data to inform the human
510 risk--the human cancer-causing potential of glyphosate. EPA
511 presented its evaluation to the FIFRA Scientific Advisory
512 Panel and received the panel's recommendation in March of
513 2017. The Agency's cancer issue paper was updated to
514 incorporate revisions, and based on the comprehensive
515 analysis of all available data and reviews, EPA concluded
516 that glyphosate is not likely to be carcinogenic to humans.

517 While the draft Human Health and Ecological Risk
518 Assessments are already publicly available on EPA's website,
519 the official public comment period for the draft risk
520 assessments and supporting science evaluations will soon be
521 announced in the Federal Register. EPA will evaluate the

522 public comments and, if needed, will revise the risk
523 assessments and then issue a proposed interim decision for
524 public comment. If necessary, the proposed interim decision
525 may include labeling changes and other risk mitigation
526 measures. After public comments on the proposed interim
527 decision are received and evaluated, EPA will issue an
528 interim decision. EPA plans to complete a final decision
529 after an endangered species assessment is complete.

530 Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I'm
531 looking forward to questions from you and the members.

532 [The statement of Ms. Lowit follows.]

533 ***** INSERT A *****

534 Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Dr. Lowit.

535 And Dr. Pastoor?

536 STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY PASTOOR

537 Mr. PASTOOR. Chairman Smith--good morning, Mr.
538 Chairman, Ranking Member Johnson, and the distinguished
539 members of this committee. Thank you for inviting me to this
540 important hearing on a very important subject.

541 I am representing myself and nine other co-authors of a
542 paper that we wrote. These are individuals that are--that
543 come from the private sector and the public sector,
544 professors that come from both the United States and the
545 European area, as well as retired senior scientists from the
546 United States EPA.

547 My testimony today is going to focus on the scientific
548 process that IARC uses, which the nine authors that I
549 co-authored the paper with have concluded is badly outmoded
550 and in need--in bad need of significant revision or
551 termination. The reason is because the program uses an
552 antiquated and irrelevant hazard classification scheme to
553 simply declare a substance to be carcinogenic or not and
554 provides no context about when, why, or how that substance
555 might actually cause that effect.

556 Let me illustrate it this way. I would imagine that

557 most of the people in this room have consumed water or food
558 or both that contained a substance that IARC Monographs
559 Programme has declared to be carcinogenic. How does that
560 make you feel? Well, the problem with that is that it's a
561 simple declaration about something that is in your food that
562 could cause cancer. What I'm talking about is caffeic acid.
563 Caffeic acid is found in a number of foods that we eat every
564 day that are part of a healthy diet, including things like
565 grapes, apples, blueberries, lemons, oranges, and it goes on.
566 And oh, by the way, caffeic acid is also part of the cup of
567 coffee that I have in front of me today. Declaring that
568 caffeic acid is a carcinogenic substance is really of no help
569 when you just state it that way. It needs to have context.

570 As a toxicologist, I'm frequently asked by family and
571 friends what it means when they hear something is declared to
572 be possibly or potentially carcinogenic. What they want to
573 know is how likely is that to happen to me, my family, my
574 friends. It's an important subject. My answer is always the
575 same. It depends on how potent the chemical is, the
576 substance is, and how much exposure is required to cause that
577 effect.

578 Let's take potency first. Unfortunately, the IARC
579 Monograph Programme fails to provide the crucial context of
580 potency and instead lumps highly potent substances like
581 plutonium, sulfur mustard, and neutron radiation in the same

582 cancer classification as processed meat and salted fish.
583 Clearly, there's a difference, but the IARC Monographs
584 Programme fails to account for potency.

585 My wife is a registered nurse and an integrative healer
586 who likes to use plant-based remedies. When I tell her that
587 aloe vera and ginkgo biloba are classified by IARC as
588 possibly carcinogenic, she rolled her eyes and said, oh, and
589 by the way, they're classified in the same category with
590 fuel, oil, and gasoline, she simply kind of rolled her eyes
591 back and say, "No, that can't be."

592 Such a classification scheme defies common sense, and
593 yet IARC has maintained this hazard classification scheme for
594 well over--in nearly half-a-century. Along with neglecting
595 the important feature of potency, IARC Monographs Programme
596 also fails to account for potential exposure. Why is that
597 important? Because the central tenet of toxicology is the
598 dose makes the poison. And the best way of giving you a good
599 analogy of that is aspirin. A little bit of aspirin is not
600 going to do anything. A couple tablets of aspirin will
601 relieve your headache, and a bottle of aspirin can kill you.
602 But where IARC stops is labeling something as being able to
603 kill you. What good is that information without the context
604 of benefits and dose?

605 Nearly all 21st-century regulatory processes such as Dr.
606 Lowit described just previously account for potency and

607 exposure in their evaluation and therefore the likelihood
608 that an adverse effect like cancer could occur. It's known
609 as risk assessment. However, the IARC Monograph Programme is
610 not risk-based and instead is stuck in a hazard
611 classification scheme created a half-a-century ago with no
612 consideration of potency or exposure.

613 In addition to being out of step with 21st-century
614 science, the IARC Monograph Programme has also lost
615 credibility because of serious flaws in process. I'm here to
616 talk about the science, not the process, but that is a
617 concerning issue.

618 Outdated science and flawed process are not without
619 consequence. Telling you that IARC has pegged caffeic acid
620 as a carcinogenic substance in your food and coffee does
621 nothing other than sow fear and uncertainty, which is
622 unhelpful and irrelevant at best and irresponsible at worst.
623 The IARC Monograph Programme needs to be either significantly
624 reformed or abolished.

625 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

626 [The statement of Mr. Pastoor follows:]

627 ***** INSERT B *****

628 Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Dr. Pastoor.

629 And Dr. Sass?

630 STATEMENT OF JENNIFER SASS

631 Ms. SASS. Thank you very much for the opportunity to
632 speak to--before this committee today about this very
633 important topic of scientific integrity, the IARC Monographs,
634 and the important evaluation of glyphosate. I very much
635 appreciate coming before you today.

636 I've been employed for 17 years at NRDC, the Natural
637 Resources Defense Council, and I have advanced degrees in
638 anatomy and cell biology with specific expertise in
639 environmental health, developmental biology, neurobiology,
640 and molecular biology and am also familiar with the Pesticide
641 Office operations that Dr. Anna Lowit is Science Advisor
642 before because on many, many occasions I've testified either
643 with written or oral comments are both to the Pesticide
644 Office following their review of pesticides and registration,
645 including glyphosate. In addition, I've represented NRDC for
646 over a decade on stakeholder advisory panels to the Pesticide
647 Office so have participated as a public and stakeholder
648 member in those processes.

649 I also have knowledge of the IARC practices, having been
650 invited to a meeting, a week-long meeting to look at arsenic

651 and water disinfection byproducts by the Chair at the time
652 the Chief of the Monograph Programme Dr. Jerry Rice, who is a
653 colleague of Dr. Tarone's. There have been two Chairs since
654 then, and the current Chair, Dr. Kurt Straif, was also
655 working at the Monograph Programme during that time, so he
656 brings with his leadership continuity to that program and to
657 IARC's commitment to environmental public health and
658 scientific excellence.

659 IARC has undertaken over 1,000 substances for
660 evaluation, including important ones like asbestos, tobacco
661 smoke, secondhand smoke, diesel exhaust, formaldehyde, vinyl
662 chloride and arsenic, methylene chloride benzene, and many
663 others. There--many of these--not all of them, but many of
664 them also come with people--stakeholders that have deep
665 economic interests in these substances, and although there
666 have been many, the Director Dr. Christopher Wild of IARC
667 right now stated that the pressure that IARC has received in
668 response to listing glyphosate as a probable human carcinogen
669 group 2A has resulted in unprecedented coordinated efforts to
670 undermine the evaluation, the program, and the organization.

671 These efforts are largely sponsored and coordinated by
672 the agrochemical industry that sought to support its own
673 regulation--its registration and approval of glyphosate in
674 the United States and around the world, to defend itself in

675 litigation against farmers that were once Monsanto customers
676 and are now cancer patients, and to prevent the labeling of
677 glyphosate-containing products as a carcinogen in the State
678 of California, which would inform the public.

679 Dr. Jonathan Samet called these strategies that could be
680 traced to the playbook of the tobacco industry to discredit
681 findings related to active and passive smoking. And I would
682 characterize them the same way.

683 This hearing is part of a kickoff that happened a few
684 months after the IARC Monographs were made public where an
685 article in The Hill was published asking for exactly this,
686 for the stripping of funding for the IARC Programme by Dr.
687 Bruce Chassy, who failed to acknowledge that he was funded by
688 Monsanto.

689 As far as the science goes, IARC did not ignore relevant
690 studies. They included all the relevant studies, including
691 the Agriculture Health Study and other review articles that
692 they looked at that were sponsored by many--many were
693 sponsored by Monsanto or the agrochemical industry, as well
694 as published articles. But the key with IARC is that they
695 need to be publicly available. It doesn't necessarily have
696 to be published but publicly available. How else can they
697 verify the findings?

698 In contrast, EPA's 2017 assessment did rely on some of
699 these review articles that--where the underlying studies were

700 not made public. And I know the Dr. Tarone is going to talk
701 about some of those. I would ask Dr. Tarone how long it took
702 him to evaluate the underlying data and studies in those
703 because the Greim, et al., for example, was only provided 30
704 days before the IARC meeting, so there's no way it could have
705 been properly evaluated based on a review article.

706 The IARC has been following systematic methods that are
707 improved worldwide, and in conclusion, I would like to say
708 that, fundamentally, this hearing is about the ability of a
709 public health agency to call a carcinogen a carcinogen even
710 if that carcinogen makes a huge amount of money for powerful
711 corporations.

712 Thank you.

713 [The statement of Ms. Sass follows:]

714 ***** INSERT C *****

715 Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Dr. Sass.

716 And Dr. Tarone.

717 STATEMENT OF ROBERT TARONE

718 Mr. TARONE. Good morning. My European Journal of
719 Cancer Prevention paper differs from most of the published
720 criticisms that you may have seen in the press and elsewhere
721 of the IARC glyphosate classification. My paper critiques
722 the deliberations of the working group completely on IARC's
723 terms.

724 I accept that IARC is evaluating hazard rather than
725 risk, but the IARC criteria for determining hazard are
726 reasonable and that the body of studies relied upon by IARC
727 is sufficiently complete to provide a valid assessment of
728 glyphosate. My critique concludes that the IARC
729 classification of glyphosate as a probable carcinogen
730 resulted from a flawed and incomplete evaluation of the very
731 rodent cancer studies that they relied upon.

732 Although the working group concluded that there was
733 sufficient evidence that glyphosate was an animal carcinogen,
734 I conclude that a proper summary of the rodent studies would
735 have difficulty supporting even the conclusion that there is
736 limited evidence that glyphosate is an animal carcinogen.

737 And I just want to discuss briefly one of several examples in

738 which exculpatory rodent data were excluded by IARC.

739 IARC concluded that glyphosate caused cancer in animals
740 primarily on the basis of two studies in CD- mice. In the
741 first study, groups of 50 male and female mice were fed diets
742 with--containing increasing dose levels of glyphosate for 2
743 years. The original study report noted a positive trend in
744 renal adenomas in male mice. The tumor counts were 0013 at
745 increasing dose levels, and this corresponds to a P value of
746 .019 based on an exact test for dose-response.

747 Additional pathological examination of renal tumors in
748 this study revealed one new adenoma in an unexposed mouse,
749 and three of the original renal tumors were upgraded from
750 adenomas to carcinomas. So for the final tumor counts after
751 pathology review, they were 0012 for carcinomas, P value of
752 .063, and 1013 for carcinomas and adenomas combined, P equals
753 .065.

754 Now, these marginally significant findings were
755 considered to be particularly consequential by the IARC
756 working group because of the alleged extreme rarity of such
757 tumors in CD-1 mice, and it was concluded from this study and
758 the study alone that glyphosate caused renal tumors in male
759 mice.

760 Now, there was no a priori expectation that glyphosate
761 should cause kidney tumors, and ordinarily such a small
762 increase in tumors would not be considered especially

763 noteworthy since around 20 organs and tissues are typically
764 evaluated in each rodent study. Nonetheless, even that small
765 observed increase would be of concern if there was also
766 evidence of an increase in renal tumors for female mice in
767 that same study. Thus, I was surprised to see that the
768 female data were not reported with a remarkable sentence
769 stating, quote, "No data on tumors of the kidney were
770 provided for female mice."

771 IARC has been evaluating rodent studies for over 40
772 years and is aware that the renal tumor rates for female mice
773 would've been provided in the same report that provided the
774 male tumor rates. IARC's staff should've been highly
775 motivated to acquire these tumor rates. I obtained the
776 female tumor rates for my review of glyphosate rodent studies
777 in the journal Critical Reviews in Toxicology. This is the
778 Greim, et al., paper that Dr. Sass referred to.

779 For females, no renal tumors were observed, so there was
780 no evidence of an increase in kidney tumors for female mice
781 exposed to the same high levels of glyphosate as males. But
782 even though there was no evidence that glyphosate caused
783 renal tumors in female mice in this study, the working group
784 still might have argued for a sex-specific effect if there
785 was evidence of such an effect in the second CD-1 mouse study
786 they relied upon. But inexplicably, in spite of devoting
787 three--and I apologize for the--there's an error in the

788 printed comments; it's three not two paragraphs to the
789 discussion of renal tumors observed in the first mouse study,
790 there is no mention at all of kidney pathology in the one
791 paragraph devoted to the second mouse study, which is simply
792 astounding. IARC staff should've been highly motivated to
793 acquire the renal tumor rates from the second study because
794 of the male results in the first study.

795 The renal tumor rates for the second study were also
796 provided in a review paper. For males, the renal tumor
797 counts at increasing glyphosate exposure level were two, two,
798 zero, and zero, and this is $P = .042$, but for an inverse
799 association, decreasing tumor rates with increasing exposure
800 level. And it's also noteworthy that two of these supposedly
801 extremely rare renal tumors were observed in the unexposed
802 mice in this study. Taken together, these two studies
803 provide no evidence whatsoever to support the conclusion that
804 glyphosate causes renal tumors in male mice, contrary to the
805 working group conclusion. And for completeness no tumors
806 were observed for female mice in the second study.

807 In conclusion, my published paper notes other instances
808 in which rodent tumor rates that supported the conclusion
809 that glyphosate caused tumors were included in IARC
810 deliberations while tumor rates from those same studies that
811 did not support that conclusion were excluded. The
812 systematic exclusion of exculpatory evidence is inexcusable,

813 | particularly when it's practiced by an influential source
814 | such as the IARC Monograph Programme. My paper was published
815 | online in August of 2016, and not one of the specific claims
816 | of data exclusion in that paper has been refuted. And
817 | reports since my paper was published and depositions of key
818 | working group members related to lawsuits filed against
819 | Monsanto have fully substantiated the facts presented and
820 | questions raised my paper.

821 | [The statement of Mr. Tarone follows:]

822 | ***** INSERT D *****

823 Chairman SMITH. Thank you, Dr. Tarone.

824 Dr. Lowit, in your testimony you mentioned that when
825 mice were injected with large doses of glyphosate that some
826 did manifest symptoms of cancer-like conditions but that when
827 the mice were just exposed to glyphosate, there was no
828 effect. There were no symptoms. It seems to me that that's
829 a huge difference. No one is suggesting that humans be
830 injected with large doses of glyphosate. Why is it that IARC
831 doesn't acknowledge the distinction between high doses that
832 are being injected and simple exposure or inhalation, which
833 has not resulted in any cancer-like symptoms? And it seems
834 to me that they are intentionally misleading the American
835 people, and maybe they have some kind of a vendetta against
836 chemical companies, but why or how do you explain the lack of
837 honesty and openness and transparency by IARC?

838 Ms. LOWIT. So thank you, Chairman Smith, for that
839 question. So I'm sorry if my South Carolina accent comes
840 out. So it's ingest, so I--through the oral route, not
841 inject through the--

842 Chairman SMITH. Okay. Ingest--

843 Ms. LOWIT. Ingest through the oral route.

844 Chairman SMITH. Okay.

845 Ms. LOWIT. So I apologize for that lack of clarity.

846 Chairman SMITH. But my--

847 Ms. LOWIT. So the question is--so I think it's

848 | important that--I'm not going to comment on the value of the
849 | IARC process. I can tell you that EPA has been fully
850 | transparent in our evaluation. Our draft issue paper was
851 | reviewed by the Scientific Advisory Panel. In fact, the
852 | transcript from that meeting is publicly accessible. We're
853 | now looking forward to public comment on our white paper for
854 | the cancer.

855 | Chairman SMITH. Any--was that--I didn't understand
856 | that. It's just a statement as to why you think they have
857 | been less than transparent?

858 | Ms. LOWIT. I think that's--I'm not going to debate the
859 | transparency of IARC.

860 | Chairman SMITH. Okay.

861 | Ms. LOWIT. What we have done at EPA whereas in cases
862 | where IARC has looked at review articles, we've acquired the
863 | raw study reports, so we've been able to look at information.
864 | The full study reports for IARC cannot do that.

865 | Chairman SMITH. I'm just curious. When you talked
866 | about large doses of ingestion by the mice, how much are you
867 | talking about? A large percentage of their body weight or
868 | how much were they--did they ingest?

869 | Ms. LOWIT. So in terms of toxicology studies, often
870 | studies--and with glyphosate are in the ingestion of hundreds
871 | of milligrams per kilogram per day and what we define as the
872 | limit dose. Internationally, most regulatory organizations

873 recognize 1,000 milligrams per kilogram per day as
874 international standard for the limit dose. And in most--in
875 many cases, glyphosate studies are actually done at that
876 limit dose--

877 Chairman SMITH. Okay.

878 Ms. LOWIT. --which is why we conclude there's very
879 little hazard.

880 Chairman SMITH. And it's very unlikely that any human
881 would ingest anything near to that equivalent amount?

882 Ms. LOWIT. Oh, no.

883 Chairman SMITH. Okay. Dr. Pastoor, you pointed
884 out--and I was going to highlight as well--that I think IARC
885 has found that something like 999 out of 1,000 substances
886 created cancer. Only one was deemed to be probably not
887 cancer-causing. Do you think that their process is flawed,
888 their investigations are flawed, and do you think they have
889 predetermined conclusions they're trying to reach?

890 Mr. PASTOOR. They may or may not. I can't really
891 comment in particular on glyphosate. I'm not here
892 representing a critique or a defense of glyphosate. But what
893 I would say is that there is a flaw in their scientific
894 process. When you don't take into consideration
895 potency--which, Chairman Smith, you just brought up--is that
896 if a significant portion of a body weight of an animal is
897 being overwhelmed with a particular chemical, whether it's

898 glyphosate or anything else, and you're declaring something
899 to be carcinogenic, that's erroneous science. That's
900 offsetting. That's misinforming the public, and it doesn't
901 serve any process and it's actually more harmful than
902 helpful.

903 Chairman SMITH. Okay. I agree. And I like that phrase
904 "erroneous science." I'm going to adopt it in this case
905 and maybe in other instances as well.

906 Dr. Tarone, you wrote a paper in 2016 and you came to
907 the conclusion that IARC's designation of glyphosate was a
908 result of a, quote, "flawed and incomplete evaluation of
909 experimental evidence." What is the general scientific
910 community's response been to that paper? And what was IARC's
911 response?

912 Mr. TARONE. There's been surprisingly little response
913 actually. I've been amazed.

914 Chairman SMITH. Okay.

915 Mr. TARONE. But with regard to IARC, I mean, this paper
916 has gone through an incredible--I mean, it's the weirdest
917 experience I've ever had in 44 years of publishing in
918 peer-reviewed journals. And it's--I mean, I just--really,
919 it's stunning. But IARC did eventually submit a letter to
920 the journal responding to my paper, and I received this in
921 January of 2016. And--no, 2017, I'm sorry, and I responded
922 to their letter. And I assumed that both letters would be

923 published in the journal along with the paper. IARC's letter
924 was not responsive to any of the specific criticisms I
925 raised.

926 Chairman SMITH. Okay.

927 Mr. TARONE. They complained about, you know, "Who
928 wrote--who paid you to do this and what role did they play in
929 writing and editing the paper?" They raised technical
930 issues about what constitutes a research study and that this
931 wasn't a research study, but they didn't deal with any of the
932 specifics.

933 Chairman SMITH. Okay.

934 Mr. TARONE. And for some reason neither letter was
935 published, and I've never been fully--

936 Chairman SMITH. Okay.

937 Mr. TARONE. I don't know. I can't figure out why that
938 happened.

939 Chairman SMITH. The point being IARC was not responsive
940 to the substance of your--

941 Mr. TARONE. Not to the substance, and as I said, nobody
942 has specifically refuted any of the claims that I've made
943 about the exclusion--

944 Chairman SMITH. Okay.

945 Mr. TARONE. --of rodent studies that should have been
946 included.

947 Chairman SMITH. Okay. Thank you, Dr. Tarone. That

948 concludes my time.

949 And the gentlewoman from Texas, the Ranking Member, Ms.
950 Eddie Bernice Johnson, is recognized for her questions.

951 Ms. JOHNSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

952 Let me precede my question with this statement. I don't
953 believe any company puts anything on the market that they
954 knowingly know that it harms people. I think it's like the
955 little book Who Moved My Cheese? Sometimes, it's hard to
956 change when you find out what the facts are. And so--and
957 every company that has any respect for itself is going to
958 defend itself when it can.

959 But I want to ask Dr. Sassa. Can you discuss the
960 importance of keeping the development of scientific
961 assessments on chemicals such as glyphosate and other toxic
962 chemicals free from undue influence by industries or others?
963 An example is what are the consequences if chemical risk
964 assessments are driven by industry, and more importantly, if
965 industry-sponsored chemical assessments are given the same
966 weight and authority as truly independent scientific studies?

967 Ms. SASS. Thank you. I would like to comment on that,
968 and I think that glyphosate is a perfect example of where
969 that's happening because we can really see the difference in
970 when you have an IARC assessment, which is a public health
971 agency of the World Health Organization that links it to some
972 level of carcinogenicity probably carcinogenic in humans.

973 And then you have--based--including on Monsanto's studies and
974 other studies supported by the registrant, and then you have
975 agencies that are calling it not likely carcinogenic, EPA,
976 which is a regulatory agency.

977 And I want to talk about some of those differences
978 because the impact on public health is severe potentially.
979 First of all, Mr. Smith's comment about the doses that
980 there--that they were--that--well, what Anna suggested
981 what--that they were at high doses, I want to talk about the
982 limit dose for a quick second because it has a toxicological
983 definition, and these studies did not exceed it. So an
984 arbitrary 1,000 mgs per kg per day was not what IARC used.
985 They used a toxicological definition. And these studies
986 didn't exceed it at the high dose, so they should have been
987 included.

988 Dr. Pastoor's statement referencing 16th century
989 Paracelsus medicine, to then criticize IARC being
990 half-a-century behind is just ridiculous. Paracelsus did say
991 the dose makes the poison, and there's a lot of truth in
992 that, but that's not the whole truth. The truth is that
993 what's being missed here is considering vulnerable
994 populations potentially. We need to protect the EPA, and
995 regulatory agencies need to be able to protect the whole
996 population, so--including pregnant women and children,
997 elders, people with preexisting diseases and chronic

998 diseases, people that are high-end users or highly exposed
999 in--as well as the Keith Richards of the world. We need to
1000 bracket all of those people and protect them.

1001 And, Dr. Tarone, I do have some answers for the
1002 exclusion of those rodent data, but primarily, they weren't
1003 available to IARC and IARC relies on public data. The data
1004 sets were huge. They were hidden in appendices. The IARC
1005 only had it 30 days in advance. But in addition, had IARC
1006 had those data, it would have likely come up with an even
1007 stronger link to cancer because there was even more tumors
1008 than Dr. Greim, the author of that review article, had
1009 revealed. Those have all come to light now through EFSA, so
1010 the European Food Safety Authority. They've been reanalyzed
1011 separately by non-industry scientists. And we now know that
1012 there's data that also show tumors in the animals linking to
1013 malignant lymphomas and hemangiosarcomas, which, Dr. Tarone,
1014 I think you didn't analyze. I think you may have focused on
1015 the kidney tumors only.

1016 So, in addition, Dr. Greim, the author of that paper, is
1017 not only of questionable scientific integrity for failing to
1018 report all those tumors but also ethical potential as well.
1019 He's the main author in some diesel emissions studies that
1020 put monkeys into chambers being reported in the New York
1021 Times right now. So--

1022 Mr. TARONE. Can I respond?

1023 Mr. LUCAS. [Presiding] Dr. Tarone, would that be
1024 appropriate for the Ranking Member?

1025 Ms. JOHNSON. Yes.

1026 Mr. LUCAS. It's her time. Please respond.

1027 Mr. TARONE. Well, it's totally incorrect to say that
1028 IARC should not have acquired those data because if--and I
1029 want to say something about the Greim paper. I relied on the
1030 Greim paper only for the data. They included supplemental
1031 tables with that review paper that included the underlying
1032 basic tables of tumor rates from every study that they
1033 reviewed. So I was not relying on Greim, et al., for their
1034 conclusion in any sense. I was only relying on it for the
1035 data.

1036 Ms. SASS. Well, the summary tables can be used, and EPA
1037 had those data for years, probably decades and didn't ask for
1038 the underlying data, so to blame IARC for not having gotten
1039 it in 30 years--

1040 Mr. LUCAS. The gentlelady's time is expired.

1041 The Chair would note to my colleagues we now have a
1042 series of three votes underway that, once the votes are over,
1043 we will return and continue this hearing. And with that, the
1044 hearing will stand in recess subject to the call of the
1045 Chair.

1046 [Recess.]

1047 Mr. LUCAS. This full committee hearing of the Science

1048 Committee is reconvened. I will return to regular order, and
1049 I believe I was the next one in line to ask questions, so
1050 I'll recognize myself for 5 minutes.

1051 And with that, I turn to Mr. Tarone. Would you care to
1052 expand and explain a little bit more about your analysis of
1053 the Monograph 112 program and all those issues?

1054 Mr. TARONE. Yes. I specifically want to answer a
1055 couple of issues that Dr. Sass raised. First with regard to
1056 hemangiosarcomas, I did consider hemangiosarcomas, and it in
1057 fact is one of the examples in which IARC excluded
1058 exculpatory data. In the second mouse study where they did
1059 not discuss renal tumors, they emphasized the finding in
1060 hemangiosarcomas that Dr. Sass referred to. And there were
1061 four hemangiosarcomas in the highest dose group, and that was
1062 all--none in the other three groups.

1063 But in the first mouse study, the one where they spent
1064 three paragraphs on renal tumors, they didn't mention
1065 hemangiosarcomas, so it's the same thing that happened with
1066 renal tumors. So--and it turns out that in that study there
1067 was one hemangioma in the low-dose group and one
1068 hemangiosarcoma in the mid-dose group and none in the
1069 highest-dose group. And by the way, that highest-dose group,
1070 glyphosate was 3 percent of the diet that they ate for every
1071 day for 2 years. It's an incredibly high dose. So you would
1072 have--if what they saw in the second study was a true high

1073 dose effect, you would have expected to see it in the first
1074 study. And--but again that was not even mentioned in the
1075 IARC Monograph.

1076 And Dr. Sass also raised the issue of the accuracy of
1077 the tumor rates that I got from the supplemental tables in
1078 the Critical Reviews in Toxicology paper. And in fact, as I
1079 pointed out at the end of my comments, everything in my paper
1080 has in fact been substantiated by things published since,
1081 including comments submitted to the EPA glyphosate SAP by
1082 Chris Portier, who was the scientific expert for the IARC
1083 working group. And his comments were presenting his
1084 statistical analysis of all of the rodent studies that EPA
1085 was considering. And they considered many more than IARC,
1086 but they also considered all the studies that IARC relied
1087 upon.

1088 If you look at his tables upon which his analysis was
1089 based, in every case in which I indicated in my paper that
1090 IARC had excluded tumor rates, those tumor rates are in those
1091 tables in the comments he submitted to EPA. They were
1092 included in his EPA analysis, which is an admission that they
1093 should have been included in the IARC analysis. Moreover,
1094 they were exactly the rates that I reported that I got from
1095 the supplementary tables in the Greim, et al., review. So
1096 certainly, Christopher Portier now thinks that those rates
1097 are okay.

1098 Mr. LUCAS. Thank you, Doctor.

1099 Dr. Pastoor, could you visit with us for a moment about
1100 the ways in which the current Monograph Programme
1101 classification system on carcinogenicity might be outdated?
1102 Expand on that, please.

1103 Mr. PASTOOR. Well, the primary reason that it's
1104 outdated and outmoded and needs to either be scrapped or
1105 considerably revised is because they stick with a hazard
1106 classification system. All they do is declare something as
1107 being carcinogenic or not. Modern 21st-century
1108 risk-assessment-oriented regulatory programs such as what Dr.
1109 Lowit has described with the United States EPA uses that
1110 risk-based system to put hazard in context of risk: how much
1111 would cause that effect; what is the potency of that
1112 particular chemical? IARC was created over--nearly 50 years
1113 ago, and they really haven't progressed beyond the point of
1114 only classifying things by its carcinogenicity but not
1115 putting it in the context of risk.

1116 Mr. LUCAS. Thank you. I think with that now I will
1117 yield back and turn to--I think in the next order would be
1118 the gentleman Mr. Tonko for 5 minutes for questions.

1119 Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And welcome,
1120 everyone.

1121 This hearing has been framed around the need to uphold
1122 scientific integrity standards in publicly funded research.

1123 If that is a serious concern for this committee, then I
1124 implore us to take up H.R. 1358, which I've authored, the
1125 Scientific Integrity Act. This Congress has a duty assigned
1126 directly to this committee to ensure that public or publicly
1127 funded science is conducted, reviewed, communicated to the
1128 public and incorporated into policymaking transparently and
1129 free from distorting political, ideological, financial, or
1130 other undue influence.

1131 Public science informs national policy on everything
1132 from pesticides to power grids. Our nation's cities and
1133 States need credible information to prepare for climate
1134 change. Our families deserve to know if unsafe chemicals are
1135 being sprayed on their food, dumped in their water, or added
1136 into the products they buy. As representatives, we need to
1137 reach conclusions on these high-stakes questions based on
1138 rigorous independent scientific facts, not predetermined
1139 opinions. We have a duty to ensure that political
1140 interference of the scientific process and attacks on the
1141 work of federal scientists do not get on the way of our
1142 safeguard our public health and our national security.

1143 The rules and norms of our public science are standards
1144 that have made America a leading light in the global
1145 scientific community for decades. We have seen those
1146 standards being actively and deliberately eroded over the
1147 past year. Scientists should always be held to the highest

1148 ethical and professional standards. In return, it is our job
1149 to uphold standards that ensure scientists are not impugned
1150 for reporting their impartial findings.

1151 The Scientific Integrity Act restores our baseline for
1152 scientific independence by requiring every federal agency
1153 that funds or conducts scientific research to establish clear
1154 scientific integrity standards and set basic requirements for
1155 how the agency will adhere to those principles.

1156 Science is not about getting the results you want.
1157 Scientific integrity is about ensuring a process and
1158 atmosphere in which the science leads us to real, unvarnished
1159 results. The issue we should be focused on is whether
1160 glyphosate is safe, and finding the answer to this question
1161 is too important for us to let this be a partisan issue.
1162 These are chemicals that people have in their homes. This is
1163 on the food our children eat. We should be able to trust
1164 that the science we rely upon to make public health decisions
1165 is not being distorted or manipulated.

1166 While the tactics used by industry to influence science
1167 may have dramatic negative consequences on the independence
1168 and credibility of scientific review boards or advisory
1169 panels, the real victims of this kind of designed ignorance
1170 are everyday people. Without credible science to determine
1171 safe levels of exposure, millions of people around our
1172 country will be at risk.

1173 Dr. Sass, how do science agencies like a IARC function
1174 in order to protect the public health?

1175 Ms. SASS. Thank you. IARC and other public health
1176 institutes put out very credible information about the
1177 potential hazards of chemicals and other substances. After
1178 reviewing all the data, IARC, for the glyphosate assessment,
1179 brought experts from all over the world from multiple
1180 different countries. They have different areas of expertise.
1181 They all come together as a working group. They--all of the
1182 discussion of all of the data--publicly available data is
1183 done in front of everybody. There's a plenary session where
1184 people get to also discuss what the different subject matter
1185 experts have come up with in their area.

1186 And the result of these very credible, transparent,
1187 publicly generated hazard assessments is to then support
1188 potentially risk assessments but also to support
1189 nonregulatory or even non-risk-related decisions that can be
1190 made, for example, not only by government regulatory agencies
1191 but also by forward-thinking companies and businesses looking
1192 to work with safer or less toxic or less hazardous chemicals
1193 are starting to replace it in their products. There's
1194 retailers that care about this. There's a whole area of
1195 green chemistry that's very interested in this, and of course
1196 medical professionals, occupational health experts, all of
1197 these people care about understanding the hazard of materials

1198 even if they don't--haven't--there hasn't been a full risk
1199 assessment to understand potency and dose-response and the
1200 other things that come afterwards.

1201 Mr. TONKO. And why is it important that independent
1202 bodies review chemicals for potential exposure risks?

1203 Ms. SASS. Well, all the available data should be looked
1204 at. I believe that, but that's also what the agencies
1205 believe and it's what IARC did. Many of the studies that
1206 relied on were supported or sponsored by the regulated
1207 industry, and that's fine. That's normal. That happens.
1208 But there are systematic review procedures for reviewing and
1209 evaluating confidence in those studies on a lot of different
1210 parameters. And if all of those different parameters aren't
1211 available to do a proper robust review and assessment of the
1212 confidence, then it's more difficult. And so we
1213 should--instead of a priori making decisions about what data
1214 is in or out of the pot, it should all be looked at and
1215 reviewed, which is what IARC did.

1216 Mr. TONKO. Thank you. Mr. Chair, I have several
1217 documents which I would like included in the record,
1218 including the Monsanto battle plan, laying out their
1219 preliminary attack on IARC, the IARC preamble defining the
1220 roles of working group members and participants, a list of
1221 participants from the IARC glyphosate Monograph commentaries
1222 by several scientists on the strength of the IARC glyphosate

1223 evaluation, the FIFRA Science Advisory Panel report from
1224 December 2016 concluding that EPA did not follow its own
1225 guidelines for carcinogen risk assessment in evaluating
1226 glyphosate, and a letter from the United Nations special
1227 rapporteur stressing how essential the work of the National
1228 Institute of Environmental Health Science is to protecting
1229 human rights.

1230 Mr. LUCAS. Without objection.

1231 [The information follows:]

1232 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

1233 Mr. LUCAS. And the gentleman's time is expired.

1234 Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1235 Mr. LUCAS. The Chair now turns to the gentleman from
1236 Texas, Mr. Babin, for 5 minutes.

1237 Mr. BABIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.
1238 And thank you to the witnesses for being here.

1239 Dr. Anna Lowit, if you don't mind, the EPA's risk
1240 assessment process explicitly includes opportunities for
1241 experts who did not contribute to the assessment to review
1242 and comment on a draft of the scientific analysis, is that
1243 correct?

1244 Ms. LOWIT. That's correct.

1245 Mr. BABIN. Okay. The EPA's risk assessments like the
1246 one on glyphosate developed by the Office of Pesticide
1247 Programs are also subjected to rigorous independent peer
1248 review. Is that correct?

1249 Ms. LOWIT. So EPA's cancer evaluation has been subject
1250 to the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel. That's true.

1251 Mr. BABIN. Okay. As I understand it, the National
1252 Academies, which is similar to IARC, develops reports by
1253 expert panels and has outside peer reviews and evaluate each
1254 and every report to ensure scientific accuracy. However,
1255 unlike EPA and NAS, IARC Monographs do not employ any
1256 independent outside peer reviews. Instead an IARC Monograph
1257 working group collaborates behind closed doors to select

1258 studies, analyze data, and reach conclusions. So without any
1259 public engagement or independent scientific peer review, the
1260 working group acts hand-in-hand with IARC staff as judges,
1261 juries, and executioners. Clearly, these IARC procedures
1262 fall well short of meeting 21st-century standards for
1263 transparency and scientific credibility. And I would like to
1264 know if you agree with that.

1265 Ms. LOWIT. So what I can answer is EPA's transparent
1266 approach, that our cancer evaluation was reviewed by the
1267 FIFRA--excuse me--Scientific Advisory Panel. The transcript
1268 from that meeting is actually publicly available. Our
1269 document is now available for public--will be open for public
1270 comment. It's been released on our docket, and so our
1271 process is quite transparent.

1272 Mr. BABIN. Do any of the other witnesses agree with
1273 that statement? Now, let me repeat it. Without any public
1274 engagement or independent scientific peer review, the working
1275 group acts hand-in-hand with IARC staff as judge, jury, and
1276 executioner. IARC procedures fall well short of meeting
1277 21st-century standards of transparency and scientific
1278 credibility. Would you other three agree with that? Dr.
1279 Pastoor?

1280 Mr. PASTOOR. Yes, I would generally agree with that. I
1281 think IARC needs to be brought up to the standards of
1282 transparency that is exhibited by the United States EPA.

1283 Mr. BABIN. Okay. Thank you. Dr. Sass?

1284 Ms. SASS. I disagree because the meetings are open at
1285 IARC. Observers are invited. Monsanto was present. Other
1286 regulatory interests can also be present, so they're public
1287 in that sense that anybody who wants to be present can.

1288 And I also want to point out that EPA's Scientific
1289 Advisory Panel review of the "not likely" classification
1290 didn't agree with that classification.

1291 Mr. BABIN. Dr. Tarone?

1292 Mr. TARONE. Yes, I wouldn't agree completely with the
1293 statement, but what I believe is that right now the Monograph
1294 Programme appears to think they have--they're accountable to
1295 no one, so I do need--I do think that they need to be brought
1296 in and show some accountability to somebody. The fact that
1297 they did what they did with the glyphosate working group, I
1298 mean, that should not happen. The exclusion of exculpatory
1299 rodent studies many times, there's just absolutely no way
1300 that should happen, so I would just like to see more
1301 accountability.

1302 Mr. BABIN. Absolutely. Okay. Is it scientifically
1303 proper to redo a peer-reviewed study's data analysis with a
1304 different statistical analysis than was originally used for
1305 the study and then use this reanalysis without first ensuring
1306 that it undergoes robust independent peer review? Dr. Lowit?

1307 Ms. LOWIT. So the first half of your question is about
1308 reevaluating scientific data, and I would agree with that
1309 statement, that that is actually part of an independent
1310 evaluation of those data is often to reevaluate the
1311 statistics. And EPA has actually in fact redone some of the
1312 statistics for the glyphosate cancer evaluation.

1313 Mr. BABIN. Okay.

1314 Ms. LOWIT. The second part of your question is about
1315 peer review. Peer review is important, and in the case of
1316 the cancer evaluation, we did have our statistics evaluated
1317 as part of the Scientific Advisory Panel.

1318 Mr. BABIN. Thank you very much.

1319 And Dr. Tarone, could I ask you that question?

1320 Mr. TARONE. I have no problem with people doing
1321 independent different types of statistical analysis,
1322 although, you know, it does have to be peer-reviewed because
1323 sometimes you can pull tricks, you know, get the result you
1324 want. I mean, there's a lot of data dredging, p-hacking it's
1325 sometimes called that goes on. So peer review is essential,
1326 though, when you're evaluating multiple different types of
1327 statistical analyses.

1328 Mr. BABIN. Absolutely. And my time is expired, Mr.
1329 Chairman. Thank you.

1330 Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman's time is indeed expired.

1331 The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California,

1332 Mr. McNerney, for 5 minutes.

1333 Mr. MCNERNEY. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I
1334 thank the witnesses.

1335 Dr. Sass, have you ever heard the term chemical
1336 trespass?

1337 Ms. SASS. Yes, I have. It's when you find a chemical
1338 in--usually an industrial chemical not naturally occurring in
1339 your body that you didn't give permission for it to be there.

1340 Mr. MCNERNEY. So do you think that term applies to our
1341 hearing this morning?

1342 Ms. SASS. I do and not just to glyphosate but certainly
1343 glyphosate. I mean, my guess is that there's not many people
1344 in the United States that are unexposed to glyphosate because
1345 of how widespread its use is. It's almost 300 million pounds
1346 annually, and every--in agriculture, and every one of those
1347 pounds are put out onto our fields, our food supplies, get
1348 into our rivers and streams and drinking water, sources of
1349 drinking water.

1350 Mr. MCNERNEY. Well, some studies claim that human
1351 exposure to glyphosate has increased by 500 percent in 25
1352 years. What kind of risks are associated with this kind of
1353 proliferation of exposure?

1354 Ms. SASS. So we don't understand the risks, and that's
1355 one of the things that I think that EPA, you know, should be

1356 doing is taking on a proper risk assessment after a proper
1357 hazard assessment where they acknowledge that there's a
1358 carcinogenic risk and then do a proper slope factor. There's
1359 proper mechanisms to do that. But the increase is being
1360 shown in people's urine, and we're--so we know that for sure.

1361 And that's why I think that there's probably no unexposed
1362 population, that we're exposed on a daily or routine basis.

1363 Mr. MCNERNEY. Is it also present in mother's milk?

1364 Ms. SASS. It is. It's widespread and it's--because
1365 it's water-soluble, it is present in all those fluids.

1366 Mr. MCNERNEY. So even the youngest members of our
1367 society are being highly exposed to this chemical?

1368 Ms. SASS. It is, and that's what brings up this dose
1369 poison fallacy, this 16th-century, you know, dose poison
1370 thing is that although it is true that, you know, we can't be
1371 poisoned if we don't dose ourselves, that's true if we're not
1372 exposed, it's also true that there's vulnerable populations.
1373 And how each of us react to those are differently--are very
1374 different so that a pregnant woman or a reproductive-age man
1375 or woman might be much more vulnerable to certain effects,
1376 reproductive effects, for example. Or if we're exposed to a
1377 carcinogen when we're young while our tissues are developing
1378 and growing and taking in--as they take in nutrients taking
1379 in those toxic chemicals, that could be a much more damaging
1380 time. And then the health impacts can be hardwired into the

1381 system, whereas, for example, if I'm exposed to a dose of
1382 lead, I have probably no reaction to the same dose of lead
1383 that could cause irreparable permanent harm in a developing
1384 child.

1385 Mr. MCNERNEY. Thank you. Some folks are critical of
1386 the World Health Organization, and other folks are critical
1387 of the EPA's risk assessment. Can you explain how those
1388 assessments differ?

1389 Ms. SASS. Sure. I mean, primarily, for some reason
1390 the--a lot of the criticism which I think isn't fair is on
1391 whether IARC considered some studies that actually weren't
1392 available to it at the time. And my only answer is they've
1393 got to look at publicly available data. That's a rule they
1394 made in advance. Industry knows that in advance. If it
1395 wants to get those studies to them in advance, they could
1396 have done so. The chemicals are nominated. They have plenty
1397 of time to do that if they want to. The--fundamentally,
1398 though, some of the ways they're looking at it are, for
1399 example, EPA is not looking at the high-dose tumors. The
1400 animals have tumors at high doses, but there's no other
1401 indication of toxicity to the animals at those doses, so
1402 there's no real reason not to consider those tumor effects to
1403 be real or valid. Like I say, instead of using an arbitrary
1404 number, to actually use toxicological ways of assessing
1405 whether those doses should be considered. So that's one

1406 | important thing is to consider those doses.

1407 | The other thing is to--when you look at it, does there
1408 | have to be a clear dose-response? EPA is throwing out data
1409 | if there wasn't an--increasing tumors with increasing doses
1410 | in every study, for example, and that's not appropriate
1411 | because many reasons. One is that we don't--we--animals
1412 | react differently, so you have to use your statistics to do
1413 | that. EPA has used a certain statistical test. I argue some
1414 | different statistical tests. The EPA cancer guideline says
1415 | EPA should use whichever one provides the most
1416 | health-protective outcome.

1417 | Mr. MCNERNEY. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have an
1418 | article published this morning by the POLITICO describing the
1419 | European Parliament's decision to create a special committee
1420 | to investigate potential failings in the EU system for
1421 | reviewing pesticides such as glyphosate. The committee will
1422 | look at whether the European Commission followed appropriate
1423 | regulations and avoiding conflict of interest when it decided
1424 | to renew the license for another 5 years. I would like to
1425 | introduce this story for the record.

1426 | Mr. LUCAS. Without objection.

1427 | [The information follows:]

1428 | ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

1429 Mr. MCNERNEY. Thank you. And I yield back.

1430 Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman yields back.

1431 The Chair now turns to the gentleman from Arizona, Mr.
1432 Biggs, for 5 minutes.

1433 Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate all
1434 the witnesses being here today.

1435 And I'll start with Dr. Pastoor. You touched on your
1436 testimony, but I'd like you to expand if you would on
1437 additional examples besides glyphosate that were perhaps
1438 classified in a misleading way by IARC.

1439 Mr. PASTOOR. Well, you know, the--what I was trying to
1440 get at in my testimony is that things like caffeic acid,
1441 arachidonic, these are chemicals that we find in our diet
1442 naturally. And by just simply declaring them to be
1443 carcinogenic is not helpful to the American public. They
1444 need some context with that. And my criticism of IARC is
1445 they don't provide that kind of context.

1446 Mr. BIGGS. And so--still with you, Dr. Pastoor.
1447 The--you've described that as a misleading way to classify
1448 these potential hazards, and you've advocated for a risk
1449 assessment as opposed to hazard assessment. And I
1450 thought--and I don't want to misinterpret, but I thought I
1451 heard Dr. Sass refer to this kind of dose-level-type thing as
1452 being 16th-century--a 16th-century approach. Do you want to
1453 rebut that?

1454 Mr. PASTOOR. I definitely do. I think it's absolutely
1455 as true as it was in the 16th century. And the best example
1456 I can give is the one I gave earlier on aspirin is that the
1457 dose makes the poison. It's just as good at a low--in fact,
1458 the actual statement by Paracelsus in the 16th century was
1459 that the difference between a medicine and a poison is the
1460 dose. Aspirin is a good example of that. Two tablets will
1461 relieve your headache. A bottle full of it will kill you.
1462 That's the dose makes the poison. It's as true today as it
1463 was back in the 16th century and long before that.

1464 It's important to realize that because in some of these
1465 studies that are being cited here, whether it's glyphosate or
1466 otherwise, these are animals that have been packed full of
1467 some of these chemicals for a lifetime. And I'm probably one
1468 of the few people in this room that's actually conducted
1469 those very studies. And they go on for 2 years. They're
1470 given to animals at the maximum dose that they can get, and
1471 even though Dr. Sassa refers to the animals not having any
1472 adverse effects, they're getting as much as 3 percent of
1473 their diet of that particular chemical. That's outrageous.
1474 It's something that no human would ever see, and the results
1475 are meaningless and not useful in the context of risk
1476 assessment and communication of that information to the
1477 American public.

1478 Mr. BIGGS. And, Dr. Lowit, I want to just ask you

1479 quickly--I don't want my time to totally expire here, but the
1480 EPA sets tolerance levels for residue of glyphosate, and
1481 you've talked about the actual exposure to chemicals, not
1482 simply ask if a chemical could ever be a carcinogen. And EPA
1483 takes a different approach than IARC. Why does EPA take the
1484 approach it takes?

1485 Ms. LOWIT. So EPA is a risk-based organization, which
1486 is consistent with federal statute and largely for the
1487 reasons that Dr. Pastoor just explained, that it is important
1488 to assess not only the hazard but the exposure of a
1489 particular chemical. And it is at that intersection of
1490 hazard and exposure where we understand risk. And our job is
1491 to understand risk to the American people.

1492 Mr. BIGGS. And I'm going to close out here by just
1493 covering a couple of statements. We've heard one
1494 of--previous questioners--when he was giving his statement
1495 prior to asking question says we don't want the, quote,
1496 "science we rely on is not distorted or manipulated," close
1497 quote. He didn't want that--our science to be distorted or
1498 manipulated. And additionally, the idea of independent
1499 bodies look at this--we want independent bodies to be looking
1500 at these types of chemicals and potential hazards to us.

1501 But what if there is a conflict of interest? And I'm
1502 going to introduce--Mr. Chairman, without objection, I'd like
1503 to introduce a letter written in 2002, 15 years ago or so, by

1504 one of our panelists Dr. Sass where she noted that IARC's
1505 working groups are made behind closed doors, no transcripts
1506 of the deliberations are publicly available. Most
1507 significant, the voting of the working group members is never
1508 made public. This lack of transparency and lack of public
1509 oversight makes peer review impossible.

1510 In the letter that we received back from Dr. Wild, at
1511 this point there's no indication that any of the processes
1512 have changed in the last 16 years, and thus, I'm very
1513 concerned about IARC and their processes in this issuing
1514 these monologues and--or, excuse me, Monographs. And with
1515 that, Mr. Chairman, I introduce that letter.

1516 Mr. LUCAS. Without objection.

1517 [The information follows.]

1518 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

1519 Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman yields back the balance of his
1520 time?

1521 Mr. BIGGS. I do, thank you.

1522 Mr. LUCAS. And the gentleman--or the Chair now turns to
1523 the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Perlmutter, for 5 minutes.

1524 Mr. PERLMUTTER. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

1525 And, Dr. Sass, I'm just going to ask you a pretty
1526 open-ended question. I've been able to sit through some of
1527 this testimony. Obviously, there's some very different
1528 approaches and opinions just listening to the last 15
1529 minutes. So are there some issues that you think really need
1530 to be brought out in more detail? And if so, what are they?

1531 Ms. SASS. Thank you. With regards to the IARC 2002
1532 letter, which I point out is quite a long time ago, at that
1533 time that was three Chiefs of the Monograph Programme ago,
1534 and at that point we were concerned that they were allowing
1535 people with financial conflicted--conflicts of interest to be
1536 part of the voting working group. And since then, they have
1537 established conflict guidelines that are world-renowned.
1538 They're very well-respected, they're very well-implemented,
1539 and those kinds of things are well-tracked and well-reported,
1540 and so there's a comfort level. And so those issues are
1541 not--have not been relevant for a long time.

1542 As far as the differences between the two assessments,

1543 | it really is a difference between whether you're doing the
1544 | hazard only and then going to risk assessment or whether
1545 | you're conflating them together. And IARC is a hazard only.
1546 | They just say whether there's an association with cancer or
1547 | not, and then if you want to do a risk assessment or
1548 | deregulatory actions, those things will come differently.

1549 | I do not understand what EPA is not going through its
1550 | process to develop a slope factor and a dose response and a
1551 | potency estimate and instead just doing--calling it not
1552 | likely, dismissing quite a lot of evidence of tumors.

1553 | And you're wrong about Dr. Portier. He's actually
1554 | updated his tables, and there's quite a few tumors there,
1555 | which I would be happy to submit or have someone else--have
1556 | him submit to the record that have been disregarded.

1557 | What I don't understand is why the Pesticide Office is
1558 | working with the EPA's Office of Chemical Safety and
1559 | Pollution Prevention, which is the science policy office,
1560 | which is headed by Dr. Nancy Beck, a former chemical industry
1561 | lobbyist, to implement a systematic review procedure for its
1562 | data that was reviewed by the National Academies in 2007 and
1563 | was called fundamentally flawed, something the National
1564 | Academies have never called anything before, instead of, for
1565 | example, working with the EPA IRIS program, the Integrated
1566 | Risk Information System program, which is in the Office of
1567 | Research and Development, the science office of EPA, and

1568 | which could work with them to develop potency estimates and
1569 | slope factors and then a risk assessment at that point.

1570 | Mr. PERLMUTTER. So--let me see. So the real difference
1571 | here is one is just sort of purely data-driven in
1572 | determining, you know, whether or not there's potential
1573 | carcinogens, and then there's kind of a political and, you
1574 | know, policy decision being made as to, okay, it's risky,
1575 | it's not, the dose is okay, the dose is not okay, but it's
1576 | problematic to begin with, but we've looked at it, you know,
1577 | on behalf of the EPA and the country and say, you know, this
1578 | is okay, but there's a problem. Is that--am I off?

1579 | Ms. SASS. No, you are spot on.

1580 | Mr. PERLMUTTER. Okay. Well, then with that, I'm going
1581 | to yield back.

1582 | Mr. LUCAS. Before the gentleman yields back, would he
1583 | yield to the doctor from the EPA for a comment?

1584 | Mr. PERLMUTTER. Sure. Which--yes.

1585 | Mr. LUCAS. Dr. Lowit.

1586 | Ms. LOWIT. Thank you for that. So I just think it's
1587 | important that we make sure the record is accurate. The
1588 | Office of Pesticide Program is actually part of the Office of
1589 | Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention. And in fact Dr.
1590 | Sasa' comments about systematic review and the IRIS program
1591 | are inaccurate. The IRIS program, as publicly discussed in
1592 | many venues in the last year, is actually moving to a

1593 systematic review with just the recommendations of the
1594 National Academies of Sciences. So EPA's evaluation is
1595 consistent with the National Academies.

1596 Mr. PERLMUTTER. Dr. Sass, do you have a comment on
1597 that?

1598 Ms. SASS. Yes, there's two different systematic reviews
1599 happening within EPA and parallel. One is being developed by
1600 Dr. Nancy Beck, a former ACC American Chemistry Council
1601 lobbyist until very recently, and one is being developed by
1602 the scientist within the IRIS program. The IRIS program, it
1603 doesn't prioritize or preferentially treat industry-supplied
1604 data, whereas the other systematic review does. For example,
1605 guideline studies--GLP it's called, good laboratory
1606 practices, which were developed for industry studies
1607 specifically to stop them from lying and cheating about their
1608 data. If you apply systematic review properly, you would
1609 look at all the data with the same rules.

1610 Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman's time is expired.

1611 Mr. PERLMUTTER. My time is expired. I yield back to
1612 the Chair.

1613 Mr. LUCAS. And on that note, the Chair is going to turn
1614 to the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins, for 5 minutes.

1615 Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the
1616 panelists for appearing before us today.

1617 We have certainly challenging issues in front of us
1618 regarding what's real and what's not. We all want to protect
1619 the American people from unnecessary harm, but we also want
1620 to move forward with sound science as we do so. So this is a
1621 bipartisan effort, and I'm quite sure that the scientists
1622 before us and the experts that have testified before us and
1623 have met with us in our offices agree that we have a common
1624 goal here, that the American farmer feeds the world.

1625 And the studies that I've read, including EPA reports
1626 and various other research documents, use verbiage like
1627 "most likely" and "probable" and "potentially increased
1628 risk" regarding the primary chemical within Roundup. It's a
1629 herbicide used to increase crop yield.

1630 So I clearly recall a few years ago the rumor that
1631 plastic bottles cause cancer. It was widespread. Now, we
1632 all drink from plastic bottles. I've never seen a colleague
1633 eat the bottle.

1634 So the usage of Roundup in reality on farms across
1635 America and in households is used very carefully because it's
1636 very expensive. They use computerized dispersion on large
1637 farm machinery to carefully disperse the stuff. Protective
1638 clothing is worn.

1639 So I would say that a hungry child that the American
1640 farmer feeds across the world by the compassion and
1641 generosity of our nation, Mr. Chairman, a hungry child is

1642 concerned about the--overcoming that hunger at that moment
1643 with food provided by the American farmer, as opposed to most
1644 likely, probable, or potentially increased risk of cancer
1645 sometime down the line.

1646 So I have a question. You said something, Dr. Lowit,
1647 very interesting earlier. You stated that EPA conducted its
1648 assessment of glyphosate with conservative risk assumption.
1649 Can you please clarify for us what that means? What is a
1650 conservative risk assumption?

1651 Ms. LOWIT. So as a measure to be resource efficient in
1652 our risk assessment process, we use a tiering process when we
1653 evaluate exposure. Our tier 1 assessments use high-end
1654 estimates that are health protective and often even compound
1655 those assumptions together. And in the case of glyphosate
1656 we've done a health protective tier 1 level for--in most
1657 cases--assessment that uses health protective conservative
1658 assumptions and came to the conclusion, despite those
1659 conservative assumptions, that there's no risk to humans,
1660 including infants and children.

1661 Mr. HIGGINS. Would you recommend changes to the IARC to
1662 make this program--in this program to ensure transparency and
1663 reliable reporting to the public that you're attempting to
1664 inform? Is there some improvement or streamlining of the
1665 scientific process where data can be shared amongst perhaps
1666 conflicting conclusions by various scientists, including

1667 scientists from other--from organizations from other nations?
1668 Can there be more transparency and inclusion of scientific
1669 data so that we can come to a conclusion? Because, you know,
1670 the loss of Roundup would definitely hurt the production of
1671 crop yield across the world, and there'd be an immediate
1672 impact felt worldwide. So do you have suggestions on how to
1673 improve the process so we can arrive at the truth ultimately?

1674 Ms. LOWIT. So EPA is not bound by our IARC conclusions,
1675 as noted in my testimony. We've come to the conclusion that
1676 glyphosate is not likely carcinogenic to humans, and that's
1677 similar to many other nations in the world, including our
1678 Canadian colleagues and the European Food Safety--

1679 Mr. HIGGINS. European colleagues. I concur.

1680 Dr. Sass, could you add to that?

1681 Ms. SASS. Well, the European assessment is being
1682 investigated because it's been shown that they took the first
1683 draft from Monsanto and they barely redlined it. So I don't
1684 think that should be held up as the high bar.

1685 And as far as transparency and the use of glyphosate, I
1686 just think a proper risk assessment should be done. And
1687 what's happening here is that the EPA is doing the hazard
1688 assessment calling it not likely without doing the slope
1689 factor and the risk assessment I'm guessing because it favor
1690 Monsanto's interest for selling it abroad.

1691 Mr. HIGGINS. Do you recommend that Roundup be pulled
1692 from the market?

1693 Ms. SASS. No, that has not been our recommendation.

1694 Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

1695 Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman yields back.

1696 The Chair now recognizes my neighbor from the great
1697 State of Kansas, Dr. Marshall, for 5 minutes.

1698 Mr. MARSHALL. Well, thank you, Chairman. And I guess I
1699 would start by--you had a standing joke with my pastor, and
1700 every week he would ask me, "Does coffee cause cancer this
1701 week, Doc?" And I would say, "Well, I hope not" because I
1702 usually had a cup of coffee in my hands. So I just continue
1703 to be amazed. I'm reading this and I see that IARC, once
1704 upon a time, actually said it was a carcinogen, so that
1705 shocks me.

1706 I'm also a little bit surprised to see that the United
1707 States has given \$48 million to IARC, which is located in
1708 Lyon, France, a beautiful place by accounts of all the
1709 paintings I've seen of that area, but I'm not sure why we're
1710 spending American dollars over there.

1711 You know, to go to my question, I'll start with Dr.
1712 Pastoor, the first one. Obviously, there's a big difference
1713 between hazard and risk, and on its webpage, IARC contends
1714 that it does not make a judgment about risk. So IARC says it
1715 does not make a judgment about risk. However, on the front

1716 page of its Monograph, it states that it evaluates
1717 carcinogenic risk to humans. This seems really misleading.
1718 I'm a biochemist. I'm a physician. You can go down the dirt
1719 here a little bit if you want to, but if it's not
1720 saying--talking about making judgment regarding to risk,
1721 saying something is carcinogenic is exactly declaring it's a
1722 risk. Can you help me understand this better?

1723 Mr. PASTOOR. Representative Marshall, thank you for
1724 that question because that's core to the testimony that I'm
1725 giving today, and that's that the difference between the word
1726 hazard and risk is absolutely crucially important because if
1727 a patient comes to you and says, "Well, what should I do
1728 about caffeic acid?" or caffeine or whatever they're asking
1729 you about, you have to put that in context, minimize your
1730 exposure or avoid it altogether, whatever it is.

1731 What IARC does is stops with half a loaf, half of the
1732 description. They're just saying it's carcinogenic and
1733 leaves it at that point. It is not a risk assessment. It's
1734 simply a hazard assessment. That's not useful. It's
1735 actually injurious. It's also I think irresponsible, and I
1736 think it's harmful to the American public.

1737 Mrs. MARSHALL. And one of our jobs here in Congress is
1738 to prioritize the dollars we do have on research. And in
1739 Kansas we have big issues with the sugarcane aphid, with the
1740 wheat mosaic virus. I mean, to me, prioritizing monies for

1741 those would seem to be--take precedent over this.

1742 I'll go to Dr. Lowit with my next question. I think
1743 just to hammer this point home, explain to me the EPA--so I'm
1744 new to Congress. How does the EPA make its assessment? Is
1745 it hazards only? When you determine what chemicals are safe
1746 or not, do you use just the hazard assessment or how do you
1747 do it?

1748 Ms. LOWIT. So, consistent with federal statute, EPA
1749 does risk assessments, so we evaluate both the hazard and the
1750 exposure and then evaluate them together.

1751 Mr. MARSHALL. Does that often lead to a--are there
1752 examples of some chemicals that are a hazard only and--as
1753 opposed to a risk as well?

1754 Ms. LOWIT. As a general rule, no. EPA does risk
1755 assessment, not hazard assessment.

1756 Mr. MARSHALL. Okay. Thank you. I yield back.

1757 Mr. LUCAS. The gentleman yields back. I believe
1758 everyone's had an opportunity for questions.

1759 Does the Ranking Member have any concluding comments?

1760 Ms. JOHNSON. I don't. Thank you.

1761 Mr. LUCAS. The Ranking Member does not.

1762 The Chair simply wishes to thank our panel for being
1763 here and to express our appreciation for the insights gained
1764 today. Obviously, this is a subject matter that we will
1765 continue to delve into with great depth.

1766 And in particular to our fellow public official from the
1767 EPA, I appreciate the challenges you're caught between.

1768 With that, the record will remain open for 2 weeks for
1769 additional written comments and written questions from the
1770 members.

1771 This hearing is adjourned.

1772 [Whereupon, at 12:32 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

SPEAKER LISTING

BABIN.	57	58	59	60			
BIGGS.	65	66	67	69			
BONAMICI.	15	19	20				
HIGGINS.	72	74	75	76			
JOHNSON.	6	9	10	45	48	78	
LOWIT.	23	40	41	42	57	58	60
	67	71	74	75	78		
LUCAS.	10	48	51	56	57	60	64
	65	68	69	71	72	76	78
MARSHALL.	76	77	78				
MCNERNEY.	61	62	63	64	65		
PASTOOR.	27	42	51	58	65	66	77
PERLMUTTER.	69	71	72				
SASS.	31	45	48	54	55	59	61
	62	63	69	71	72	75	76
SMITH.	2	6	9	10	15	19	20
	27	31	35	40	41	42	43
	44						
TARONE.	35	43	44	47	48	49	59
	60						
TONKO.	51	55	57				
WEBER.	9						

YORK STENOGRAPHIC SERVICES, INC. 1

Not for Public Distribution

CONTENTS

STATEMENTS OF ANNA LOWIT, SENIOR SCIENCE ADVISOR, OFFICE OF
PESTICIDE PROGRAMS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY; TIMOTHY
PASTOOR, CEO, PASTOOR SCIENCE COMMUNICATIONS; JENNIFER BASS,
SENIOR SCIENTIST, NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL; AND
ROBERT TARONE, MATHEMATICAL STATISTICIAN, U.S. NATIONAL
CANCER INSTITUTE, AND BIOSTATISTICS DIRECTOR, INTERNATIONAL
EPIDEMIOLOGY INSTITUTE

PAGE 23

STATEMENT OF ANNA LOWIT

PAGE 23

STATEMENT OF TIMOTHY PASTOOR

PAGE 27

STATEMENT OF JENNIFER BASS

PAGE 31

STATEMENT OF ROBERT TARONE

PAGE 35

INDEX OF INSERTS

***** INSERT 1 *****	
PAGE	5
***** INSERTS 2, 3 *****	
PAGE	8
***** INSERT 4 *****	
PAGE	14
***** INSERT 5 *****	
PAGE	18
***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****	
PAGE	19
***** INSERT A *****	
PAGE	26
***** INSERT B *****	
PAGE	30
***** INSERT C *****	
PAGE	34
***** INSERT D *****	
PAGE	39
***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****	
PAGE	56
***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****	
PAGE	64

***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

PAGE

68

Not for Public Distribution

Not for Public Distribution

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/14/2018 4:14:20 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
CC: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Hearing followup

Juliya – I'll give you a call. Thanks,
Sven

Sven-Erik Kaiser
U.S. EPA
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (1305A)
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2753 (o)
202-566-1061 (c)

From: Ringel, Aaron
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 11:12 AM
To: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>
Subject: RE: Hearing followup

Hi Juliya, happy to set up a call. Sven will coordinate, not sure what everyone's schedule looks like for today but we'll circle back around shortly.

-Aaron

From: Grigoryan, Juliya [mailto:Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 11:07 AM
To: Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Hearing followup

Hi Sven and Aaron,

Thank you both again for helping facilitate Dr. Lowit's appearance at the Feb 6 hearing. The Chairman had a couple follow-up questions for Dr. Lowit regarding the EPA process on evaluating glyphosate. Could we set up a quick call with our team? We are available today if that works for you all.

Best,

Juliya Grigoryan
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

202-565-0816

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/14/2018 4:07:01 PM
To: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]
Subject: Hearing followup

Hi Sven and Aaron,

Thank you both again for helping facilitate Dr. Lowit's appearance at the Feb 6 hearing. The Chairman had a couple follow-up questions for Dr. Lowit regarding the EPA process on evaluating glyphosate. Could we set up a quick call with our team? We are available today if that works for you all.

Best,

Juliya Grigoryan
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
202-226-8816

Message

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 2/2/2018 11:04:51 PM
To: Dziadon, Daniel [Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: Feb 6 House Science Hearing - EPA testimony and Short Bio
Attachments: House Science.glyphosate.EPA testimony.pdf; Anna Lowit Bio.docx

Attached please find EPA's written testimony and short bio for the Feb 6 hearing on glyphosate. I'll bring over 65 copies as requested on Monday. Please let me know if any questions. Thanks,
Sven

Sven-Erik Kaiser
U.S. EPA
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (1305A)
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2753 (o)
202-591-4061 (c)

From: Dziadon, Daniel [mailto:Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 3:44 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Hearing Invitation

Good afternoon,

Please find attached your invitation to appear at the Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing titled, *"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review,"* on February 6, 2018.

Please let me know if you have any questions! We look forward to having you.

Best,
Daniel Dziadon

Daniel Dziadon
Policy Assistant | Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
Subcommittee on Energy | Subcommittee on Environment
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

(202) 595-6551

Anna B. Lowit, Ph.D., received her Ph.D. in Environmental Toxicology from the University of Tennessee in 1998. Dr. Lowit has worked on pesticide risk assessment for nearly 20 years. Dr. Lowit currently serves as the Science Advisor in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Pesticide Programs. Dr. Lowit is currently one of the co-chairs of Interagency Coordinating Committee on the Validation of Alternative Methods and leads multidisciplinary teams on a variety of cross cutting topics. She also has experience in cumulative risk assessments, science integration along multiple lines of evidence, and improving the use of quantitative approaches in human health risk assessment.

Not for Public Distribution

TESTIMONY OF
ANNA B. LOWIT
SCIENCE ADVISOR, OFFICE OF PESTICIDE PROGRAMS
U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
BEFORE THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY
February 6, 2018

Good morning Chairman Smith, ranking Member Johnson and members of the committee. My name is Anna Lowit. I serve as the Science Advisor in the Office of Pesticide Programs of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. I have a Ph.D. in Environmental Toxicology from the University of Tennessee and have worked at the EPA since 1998. In my role as Science Advisor, I provide advice and guidance to senior management and staff concerning toxicity testing, risk assessment, and science policy issues of national and international importance related to pesticides.

The EPA regulates the manufacture and use of all pesticides in the United States and establishes maximum levels for pesticide residues in food, thereby safeguarding the nation's food supply, workers, and the general public. The EPA implements the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA); the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act (PRIA); and key parts of the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) and Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), along with the Endangered Species Act. Under these statutes, new pesticides and new

uses of existing pesticides are evaluated before they can enter the market. In addition, existing pesticides are re-evaluated at least every 15 years to determine whether they continue to meet the standard for registration. This program is known as registration review.¹ The EPA must complete registration review by October 1, 2022, for all pesticides registered as of October 1, 2007.

The process the EPA uses for evaluating the potential for human health and ecological effects of a pesticide is called risk assessment. The EPA uses the risk assessment process established by the 1983 National Research Council in the report on “Risk Assessment in the Federal Government: Managing the Process.”² This process is widely used across the federal government and considers how toxic a chemical may be, what exposures may occur to a chemical, and the issues and uncertainties associated with a calculated risk. In fiscal year 2017, the EPA evaluated more than 120 pesticides using the risk assessment process.

The EPA’s Office of Pesticides Programs is a science driven organization, employing more than 300 scientists. To evaluate the hazard of pesticides effects, we employ toxicologists, epidemiologists, botanists, and biologists. To evaluate the exposure of pesticides, the office employs industrial hygienists, chemists, physical scientists, agronomists, geologists, hydrologists, and environmental engineers. The office has entomologists and microbiologists who ensure the products we register are efficacious. The EPA also has statisticians, mathematicians, computer scientists, and experts in the Geographic Information System to support predictive modeling approaches. Our scientists work together in interdisciplinary teams

¹ See <https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-reevaluation/registration-review-process>

² National Research Council. 1983. *Risk Assessment in the Federal Government: Managing the Process*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. Available at <https://doi.org/10.17226/366>.

to evaluate the complex science associated with pesticide risk assessment. Our scientists also routinely work with risk managers and attorneys to support science based decision making in accordance with the relevant statutes. Within the limits defined by federal statutes, we also consider the benefits of pesticides to users, growers, and to society.

Scientists in the EPA's Office of Pesticides Programs work collaboratively with other program offices and regions within the EPA such as the Office of Water, the Office of Air, and the Office of Children's Health Protection. We engage with and depend upon input from the agency's Office of Research and Development to help solve some of our most challenging science issues. In addition, the EPA's scientists are involved in projects with states and other federal agencies such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention on numerous topics. The agency is involved internationally with at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Health Organization (WHO) to support harmonization and advancing risk assessment science. The EPA's methods are broadly accepted on an international basis. Many countries have adopted the methods developed and used by the EPA.

Under FIFRA, the EPA requires substantial amounts of toxicology and exposure data to be collected and submitted for pesticide registration. For example, numerous studies involving laboratory animals are conducted on a variety of pesticidal effects such as cancer and systemic toxicity. The FQPA requires specific consideration of the potential for infants and children to be sensitive to pesticides. Accordingly, the EPA requires testing on developmental toxicity and

reproductive toxicity and often specific evaluations on neurotoxicity and brain development. Multiple species are tested, namely rats, mice, dogs, rabbits, birds, fish, plants, bees and other insects. These tests range in their duration of exposure from a single day up to the entire lifetime of the laboratory animal and are conducted in different routes of exposure such as oral, dermal, inhalation.

Risk is not only a function of the toxicity of a chemical, it is also related to exposure that can occur due to its use. The EPA quantifies exposure to all facets of the U.S. population by considering diet and drinking water, as well as from other possible contact with pesticides both in the general population and as part of their job. The EPA also considers exposure in the environment to various plant and animal species. Many types of diverse data are required to evaluate such exposure patterns. These include monitoring of pesticide users (e.g., occupational exposure), behavioral information (e.g., dietary intake patterns), data intended to quantify how pesticides behave in the environment (e.g., chemical fate, transport, and persistence), as well as data to quantify what pesticides could end up in food (e.g., residue from crops where a pesticide is applied). These data requirements are found in 40 CFR Part 158.

To ensure data quality and consistency, the EPA has standard guidelines for how testing is to be conducted. The EPA's test guidelines are largely harmonized with those established internationally by the OECD. Harmonized test guidelines reduce the burden on chemical producers and conserve scientific resources, including reducing use of laboratory test animals while maintaining a thorough evaluation of the toxicity profile of pesticides.

The EPA strives for transparency in our scientific analysis. Our science policies, guidance documents, and guidelines have been through peer review and public comments, and are publicly available. The agency's scientists develop independent, objective evaluations of studies sponsored by pesticide registrants and those available in the open scientific literature. The EPA's science reviews are publicly available in the federal docket and the agency's scientists routinely give presentations to the public and to other scientific experts. The EPA frequently meets with stakeholders, including industry, growers, non-governmental organizations, and states, on numerous issues pertaining to pesticides.

The EPA uses a tiered approach to conduct risk assessment in order to focus its efforts on areas where additional refinement is needed. This is practical from both a regulatory and resource perspective, as it allows the EPA and the regulated community to focus on critical issues and refine as needed, and conserves resources. In this approach, the EPA starts with highly conservative risk assessment then adds refinement as appropriate. For example, when dietary intake is evaluated, the EPA might assume the entirety of a particular crop is treated using the maximum allowable amount of pesticide when crops are not actually produced this way. As a refinement, information related to how much of a particular crop is treated could be considered. Amounts in food close to the point of consumption, such as sampled from a grocery store, is another refinement.

Glyphosate (commonly known as Roundup®) was initially registered by the EPA in 1974. Glyphosate acid and several related glyphosate salt compounds are also registered pesticides. Glyphosate is one of the most widely used agricultural pesticides in the United States,

with approximately 270 million pounds of active ingredient applied annually (2011-2015). Glyphosate is used on a large number of agricultural crops, primarily glyphosate-resistant corn and glyphosate-resistant soybeans. Glyphosate also makes up 40 percent of the total pounds of herbicides sold in the U.S. residential consumer market for use on lawns and turf. Other important uses are direct uses in aquatic systems and rights-of-way for total vegetation control.

Registration review for glyphosate was initiated in 2009. As mentioned above, the EPA has a statutory registration review process that is being applied to all registered pesticides, including glyphosate, involving evaluation of significant amounts of scientific information. As part of this process, several types of assessments have been initiated including evaluations of human health, ecological risk, carcinogenicity, endocrine disruption, and risk to pollinators and endangered species. The assessments are subject to extensive technical review and public comment at several time points throughout the review process.

The EPA released the draft human health and ecological risk assessments on December 18, 2017.³ The EPA's human health review evaluated dietary, residential/non-occupational, aggregate, and occupational exposures. Glyphosate is considered to have little to no hazard when exposure is to the skin and when it is inhaled. Effects in laboratory animals were only seen through ingestion at high doses. In the case of glyphosate, the human health risk assessment was developed with high end assumptions known to be overestimates of exposure. However, even with these assumptions, no risk to humans, including infants and children, were identified. This conclusion about showing no risk to humans is consistent with risk assessment findings in other

³ See <https://www.epa.gov/ingredients-used-pesticide-products/draft-human-health-and-ecological-risk-assessments-glyphosate>.

countries and international organizations such as Canada, Australia, and the European Food Safety Authority.

As required under the FFDCA, glyphosate was subject to endocrine screening as part of the EPA's Endocrine Disruptor Screening Program (EDSP). The EPA received and reviewed all the required Tier I assay data. Based on weight of evidence considerations, there is no convincing evidence of potential interaction with the estrogen, androgen or thyroid pathways, and no additional EDSP related studies are considered necessary.

In 2015, the International Agency on the Research for Cancer (IARC) released its final conclusions that glyphosate is "probably carcinogenic to humans (Group 2A)."⁴ In 2016, the EPA conducted a comprehensive analysis of all the available laboratory animal carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, and epidemiology data to inform the human carcinogenic potential of glyphosate. In December 2016, the EPA presented its evaluation to the FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP). The EPA received the SAP's recommendations in March 2017. The agency's cancer issue paper was updated to incorporate revisions based on the SAP's report. Based on the comprehensive analysis of all available data and reviews, the EPA concludes that glyphosate is "not likely to be carcinogenic to humans." The EPA's cancer classification for glyphosate is based on a weight of evidence evaluation in accordance with the agency's 2005 Guideline for Carcinogen Risk Assessment.⁵ The dataset considered by the EPA included studies submitted for registration of glyphosate, as well as studies identified in the open literature as part of a systematic review.

⁴ See <http://monographs.iarc.fr/ENG/Monographs/vol112/mono112-10.pdf>.

⁵ See <https://www.epa.gov/risk/guidelines-carcinogen-risk-assessment>.

There are some fundamental differences between the IARC review and the EPA's review of glyphosate. For instance:

- IARC only considers data that has been published or accepted for publication in the openly available scientific literature. As a result, IARC only considered 10 laboratory animal cancer studies whereas the EPA includes 14 laboratory animal cancer studies in its evaluation;
- IARC does not consider exposure and only bases its decision on the hazard of a chemical where the EPA considers exposure as a critical component of the cancer evaluation;
- IARC's conclusion is inconsistent with the international community, where the EPA's conclusion that glyphosate is "not likely to be carcinogenic to humans," is consistent with other countries and international organizations including: Australia (2013), Canada (2015), Japan (2016), New Zealand (2016), the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) (2015), Germany (2014), the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) (2017) and the Joint Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues (JMPR) (2016).

On November 9, 2017, the National Cancer Institute, which is part of the National Institutes of Health (NIH), published a new epidemiology study entitled "Glyphosate Use and Cancer Incidence in the Agricultural Health Study".⁶ The Agricultural Health Study (AHS) is a prospective cohort of more than 57,000 licensed pesticide applicators in Iowa and North Carolina. The results of this new study, which has a longer follow up period than previously

⁶ J Natl Cancer Inst. 2017 Nov 15. doi: 10.1093/jnci/djx247, available at <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29135945>.

available evaluations of the AHS cohort, provide additional strong support for the agency's conclusion that glyphosate is "not likely to be carcinogenic to humans."

In an ecological risk assessment, the EPA evaluates the potential that exposure to pesticides may cause harmful effects to non-target organisms. The effects can be direct, such as fish deaths from a pesticide entering waterways, or birds do not reproduce normally after ingesting contaminated fish, or indirect, such as a bird that can't reproduce because the plant it requires for nesting has been stunted by pesticide exposure. Specific to glyphosate, the ecological risk assessment indicates that there is potential for effects on birds (surrogates for reptiles and terrestrial-phase amphibians), mammals, and terrestrial and aquatic plants but not fish (surrogates for aquatic-phase amphibians) or aquatic invertebrates. Available data show low toxicity for honeybees and other terrestrial invertebrates.

While the draft human health and ecological risk assessments are already publicly available on the EPA website⁷, the official public comment period for the registration review of the draft glyphosate risk assessments and supporting science evaluations will soon be announced in the Federal Register. Once announced, this will begin the official public comment period which is anticipated to last for 60 days. After public comments are received on the risk assessment, if needed, the EPA will revise its risk assessments and issue a Proposed Interim Decision for public comment. If necessary, the Proposed Interim Decision will include proposed labeling changes and other risk mitigation measures. After public comments on the Proposed Interim Decision are received and evaluated, the EPA will issue an Interim Decision. The EPA

⁷ See <https://www.epa.gov/pesticides/epa-releases-draft-risk-assessments-glyphosate>.

plans to complete a Final Decision after an evaluation of risks to pollinators and an endangered species assessment is complete. In addition, the EPA plans to initiate endangered species consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service by 2020. As mentioned earlier, registration review must be completed by 2022.

In sum, the EPA has a statutory registration review process that is being systematically and transparently applied to glyphosate and all other pesticides reviewed by EPA. The EPA's pesticide risk assessments are based upon science and are subject to extensive science technical review and public comment. Draft risk assessments on glyphosate for human health and ecological effects are publically available at this time.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I will be happy to answer any questions you and the other members may have.

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/16/2018 9:48:12 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Flag: Follow up

Great please call me at [225x8543] thanks.

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 4:47 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Yep, that works, thanks.

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Sure -- would 10:00 a.m. work?

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Hey Joe, do you have time tomorrow to do a quick call with Sven and I over here about this proposed hearing?

Thanks,

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Witness Request February 6

Aaron,

The Science Committee is holding a Full Committee hearing that will examine the recent studies on glyphosate. As are you aware, EPA has undertaken extensive review of glyphosate in the re-registration process and have found that it is not likely to be carcinogenic. The Chairman is very interested in having EPA provide testimony on its extensive research of this chemical and the processes that are currently in place at EPA to provide this analysis. We aim to show that EPA's current scientific examination is credible and based on sound science. We would like to contrast this with recent scientific reports in the IARC monograph program, which cause confusion for consumers and regulators, as these reports are often based on questionable science and the pre-cautionary principal. Please let us know when you have identified the appropriate witness to testify on February 6th at 10:00 a.m. Always happy to discuss more on the phone.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/16/2018 9:45:22 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Sure -- would 10:00 a.m. work?

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Hey Joe, do you have time tomorrow to do a quick call with Sven and I over here about this proposed hearing?

Thanks,

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Witness Request February 6

Aaron,

The Science Committee is holding a Full Committee hearing that will examine the recent studies on glyphosate. As are you aware, EPA has undertaken extensive review of glyphosate in the re-registration process and have found that it is not likely to be carcinogenic. The Chairman is very interested in having EPA provide testimony on its extensive research of this chemical and the processes that are currently in place at EPA to provide this analysis. We aim to show that EPA's current scientific examination is credible and based on sound science. We would like to contrast this with recent scientific reports in the IARC monograph program, which cause confusion for consumers and regulators, as these reports are often based on questionable science and the pre-cautionary principal. Please let us know when you have identified the appropriate witness to testify on February 6th at 10:00 a.m. Always happy to discuss more on the phone.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 566-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/16/2018 6:34:56 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: Circling Back on Administrator Meeting

Flag: Follow up

Aaron,

It was great to see you last week and appreciate the Administrator's time. Chairman Smith is very keen for our staff to get together to discuss further transparent science-based regulations at the EPA. We can meet at your earliest convenience with the appropriate EPA staff to discuss this matter further. When you have identified who is best to handle this matter moving forward please let me know and we can schedule some time to discuss. Hope to hear from you soon. Next week we are not in session so we should have a number of days and times available.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/16/2018 6:31:23 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Subject: Witness Request February 6

Flag: Follow up

Aaron,

The Science Committee is holding a Full Committee hearing that will examine the recent studies on glyphosate. As are you aware, EPA has undertaken extensive review of glyphosate in the re-registration process and have found that it is not likely to be carcinogenic. The Chairman is very interested in having EPA provide testimony on its extensive research of this chemical and the processes that are currently in place at EPA to provide this analysis. We aim to show that EPA's current scientific examination is credible and based on sound science. We would like to contrast this with recent scientific reports in the IARC monograph program, which cause confusion for consumers and regulators, as these reports are often based on questionable science and the pre-cautionary principal. Please let us know when you have identified the appropriate witness to testify on February 6th at 10:00 a.m. Always happy to discuss more on the phone.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/11/2018 2:41:39 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
CC: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Sorry for the slow response. Thanks for this information, Kyle; it is helpful. Hope to hear from you all soon once the process is complete.

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2018 3:51 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – At this point, our eDiscovery division is still searching the Outlook accounts of all custodians that may have been involved in the IRIS RFC process for emails and attachments containing relevant keywords such as “RFC” and reference numbers for specific RFC requests. Once the search process is complete, the files will be processed and loaded into a review platform in which my team will review for responsiveness.

That’s all I have for now, but will keep you updated as the process progresses.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 2:02 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks, Kyle. The Chairman is asking where EPA is in the process of providing this information. If you do not have a solid time estimate, can you at least tell me at what stage they are in the process? Any insight into what is being done would be helpful for me to pass along to Chairman Smith.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 5, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Thanks, Happy New Year to you as well. Unfortunately the folks running the search don't have any information for us yet. The search is still going and they don't yet have an estimate of when it will be done. I reiterated that this is priority for us and I can send you a timeline as soon as we know the number of possibly responsive documents. I realize this process is moving slowly and I appreciate your patience.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,
Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [<mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham

Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology

2321 Rayburn House Office Building

202-26-671

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/30/2018 8:54:23 PM
To: Dziadon, Daniel [Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Lowit, Anna [Lowit.Anna@epa.gov]
CC: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Subject: House Science Hearing Invitation

Daniel - got it – thanks. Looking forward to participating. Please let me know if any questions. Best,
Sven

Sven-Erik Kaiser
U.S. EPA
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (1305A)
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2753 (o)
202 Ex 6619 (c)

From: Dziadon, Daniel [mailto:Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2018 3:44 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Lowit, Anna <Lowit.Anna@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Hearing Invitation

Good afternoon,

Please find attached your invitation to appear at the Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing titled, *"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review,"* on February 6, 2018.

Please let me know if you have any questions! We look forward to having you.

Best,
Daniel Dziadon

Daniel Dziadon
Policy Assistant | Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
Subcommittee on Energy | Subcommittee on Environment
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

202 Ex 6371

Message

From: Dziadon, Daniel [Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/30/2018 8:44:17 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Lowit, Anna [Lowit.Anna@epa.gov]
CC: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Subject: Hearing Invitation
Attachments: 01_30_2018 CLS - Dr. Lowit Hearing Invite.pdf

Good afternoon,

Please find attached your invitation to appear at the Science, Space, and Technology Committee hearing titled, *"In Defense of Scientific Integrity: Examining the IARC Monograph Programme and Glyphosate Review,"* on February 6, 2018.

Please let me know if you have any questions! We look forward to having you.

Best,
Daniel Dziadon

Daniel Dziadon
Policy Assistant | Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
Subcommittee on Energy | Subcommittee on Environment
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

(202) EX-66371

Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

2321 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6301

(202) 225-6371

www.science.house.gov

January 30, 2018

Dr. Anna Lowit
Senior Science Advisor
Office of Pesticide Programs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460

Dear Dr. Lowit,

The Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the U.S. House of Representatives will hold a hearing on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 10:00 a.m. in Room 2318 of the Rayburn House Office Building. I would like to formally request the attendance to testify at this hearing. The purpose of the hearing is to examine the scientific underpinnings, principles, and procedures at the International Agency for Research on Cancer's (IARC) Monograph Programme. This hearing will use the review of glyphosate by both IARC and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) as a case study.

In order to allow sufficient time for questions at the hearing, you should highlight the most significant points of your testimony in an oral presentation of no more than five minutes. You are requested to submit a written statement, which may be of any reasonable length and may contain supplemental materials; however, please be aware that the Committee cannot guarantee that supplemental material will be included in the printed hearing record. Please include a one-page summary of the major points you wish to make. Oral statements and answers to Member questions will be printed as part of the verbatim record of the hearing; only technical, grammatical, and typographical errors will be corrected.

Witnesses testifying before the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology must observe procedures governing witness testimony. These procedures are described in the following enclosures and provide important details concerning the preparation and presentation of your testimony before the Committee:

- The first enclosure outlines the rules governing appearance before the Committee.
- The second enclosure provides you with the Committee's Hearing Room Capabilities.
- The third enclosure provides you with the Truth-In-Testimony Instructions and the Truth-In-Testimony Disclosure Form.

- The fourth enclosure provides you with the False Statements Act Certification Form.

Please email your testimony, biography, truth-in-testimony form, and False Statements Act Certification form in a searchable PDF format, to Mr. Daniel Dziadon at Daniel.Dziadon@mail.house.gov as soon as they are available, but not less than 48 hours before the hearing. Forty-five printed copies of your testimony and biography, and one original, signed copy each of your truth-in-testimony and False Statements Act Certification forms, must be hand delivered to the Committee's main office, Room 2321 Rayburn, 48 hours before the hearing. Due to increased security measures in place at House office buildings, you will need to contact Daniel Dziadon at (202) 225-6371 to arrange for the delivery of your testimony. I recommend that you attach your biography to the testimony.

In addition, if you wish to use the Committee's multimedia facilities, a description of which is enclosed, please contact Committee IT staff at SSTIT@mail.house.gov. Our staff can usually accommodate most requests with 72 hours' notice.

If you have any questions concerning any aspect of your testimony, please contact Ms. Juliya Grigoryan of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology staff at (202) 225-9816 or at Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov. I look forward to your participation in the hearing.

Sincerely,



Lamar Smith
Chairman

Enclosures (1) Rules Governing Appearance before the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
(2) Hearing Room Capabilities
(3) Truth-In-Testimony Instructions and Truth-In-Testimony Disclosure Form
(4) False Statements Act Certification Form

MEMORANDUM

**TO: WITNESSES APPEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON
SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY DURING THE 115th
CONGRESS**

FROM: COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

**RE: RULES GOVERNING APPEARANCE BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE**

The following procedures govern witnesses appearing before the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for the 115th Congress:

1. The Rules of the Committee require you to complete the attached **Truth-In-Testimony Disclosure Form** to disclose the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the two previous fiscal years by you or by an entity represented by you which are relevant to the subject matter of your testimony or the hearing at which you are testifying. Should you need extra space, please provide additional information on a separate sheet of paper.
2. You must submit to the Committee a **draft copy of your written testimony no less than 72 hours**, excluding weekends and Federal holidays, before you are to testify.
3. **No less than 48 hours**, excluding weekends and Federal holidays, before you are to testify, you must also submit to the Committee:
 - An **electronic copy of your final written testimony**, preferably in searchable PDF format, including any supporting graphs, charts, or slideshows. This electronic version will be posted on the Committee website, and will be accessible by the public.
 - **Sixty-five (65) hard copies of your final written testimony**, including any supporting graphs, charts, or materials;
 - An **electronic copy of a short narrative biography**;
 - **Sixty-five (65) hard copies of a short narrative biography**;

- Two (2) hard copies of your Curriculum Vitae; and
 - Two (2) hard copies, including one signed original, of your completed Truth-In- Testimony Disclosure Form.
 - Two (2) hard copies, including one signed original, of your completed False Statements Act Certification Form.
5. You must notify the Committee **no later than 48 hours** before you are to testify if you **want to use any multimedia capabilities** as provided by the hearing room, and must provide all material to be presented in this fashion in hard copy form to the Committee. Please see *Enclosure 2* for further explanation of hearing room capabilities.
- If you are using any of the room's multimedia capabilities, you or your designee **must arrive no less than 30 minutes before the designated start time of the hearing** to allow for set-up. Failure to do so may result in the multimedia portion of the presentation being canceled.
6. Transcripts of hearings conducted by the Committee shall be published in substantially verbatim form, subject only to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

NOTE: Section 210 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 applies the rights and protections covered under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 to the United States Congress. Accordingly, the Committee on Science and Technology strives to accommodate / meet the needs of those requiring special assistance. If you need special accommodation or require materials in alternative formats, please contact the Committee on Science and Technology in advance of the scheduled event (3 days requested) by telephone at (202) 225-6371, by facsimile at (202) 226-0113, or TTY (202) 226-4410.

**COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY
HEARING ROOM CAPABILITIES**

Equipment Capabilities

- A) **PROJECTOR**—The hearing room is equipped with a ceiling-mounted projector capable of displaying computer graphics and video feed.
- B) **DROP DOWN VIDEO SCREEN**—The rear of the hearing room is equipped with a large drop down screen viewable from the dais and side seats.
- C) **WALL-MOUNTED LCD MONITORS**—The hearing room is equipped with two monitors, one on each side of the room, for audience viewing.
- D) **WITNESS MONITOR** – A monitor will also be in place in front of the witness table so witnesses can see the screen, as well.

Computer- Based Presentation

Please bring your presentation on a memory stick (flash drive, thumb drive) or on your personal laptop to the hearing room at least a half-hour before the hearing so that we may help you set it up at the witness table. If you bring your presentation on a laptop, your laptop should be equipped with a functioning graphics port with either a VGA or MAC external connector. Because there are many makes and models of laptops, please be prepared to operate the external graphics port for your own laptop.

Audiovisual/Multimedia Capabilities

- A) The room supports the following transmission methods to broadcast committee activities to remote sites:
 - 1. Telephone Conferencing (Audio Only).
 - 2. Live Audio-Video Streaming (Webcasting).
 - 3. Video Teleconferencing.
 - 4. Video and Audio overflow transmission to room 2325.
- B) The room receives House Cable TV feeds for display.
- C) The hearing room equipment can playback and display compact discs, dvd discs, and overhead slides.

Equipment Support

Questions should be directed to Committee IT staff at SSTIT@mail.house.gov.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE TRUTH-IN-TESTIMONY DISCLOSURE FORM

In General. The accompanying form is intended to assist witnesses appearing before the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in complying with Rule XI, clause 2(g)(5) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and Rule III, clause (c)(5) of the Rules of the Committee, requiring that:

In the case of a witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity, a written statement of proposed testimony shall include a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of any Federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts, or contracts or payments originating with a foreign government, received during the current calendar year or either of the two previous calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness and related to the subject matter of the hearing. The disclosure . . . shall include the amount and source of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof), cooperative agreement, or contract (or subcontract thereof) related to the subject matter of the hearing; and the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government. Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy or security of the witness, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than one day after the witness appears.

Please complete the form in accordance with these directions.

1. ***Name (Item 1 on the form).*** Please provide the name of the witness in the box at the top of the form.
2. ***Governmental Entity (Item 2).*** Please check the box indicating whether or not the witness is testifying on behalf of a government entity, such as a Federal department or agency, or a State or local department, agency, or jurisdiction. Trade or professional associations of public officials are not considered to be governmental organizations.
3. ***Nongovernmental Entity (Item 3).*** Please check the box indicating whether or not the witness is testifying on behalf of an entity that is not a governmental entity.
4. ***Entity(ies) to be Represented (Item 4).*** Please list all entities on whose behalf the witness is testifying.
5. ***Grants, Cooperative Agreements, and Contracts (Item 5).*** Please list any Federal grants, cooperative agreements or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) that the witness personally or the entity the witness is representing has received from the Federal Government on or after December 31, 2015.
6. ***Payments originating with a foreign government (Item 6).*** Please list all foreign government payments paid to the witness personally or to the entity the witness is representing.
7. ***Representational Capacity (Item 7).*** If the answer to the question in item 2 is yes, please characterize the capacity in which the witness is testifying on behalf of the entities listed in item 4.

Enclosure 3

8. ***Affiliated Entities (Item 8).*** Please indicate whether the entity on whose behalf the witness is testifying has parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships that are not represented by the testimony of the witness.
9. ***Grants, Cooperative Agreements, and Contracts (Item 9).*** Please disclose grants, cooperative agreements, and contracts as directed.
10. ***Submission.*** Please sign and date the form in the appropriate place. Please submit this form with your written testimony. Please note that under the Committee's rules, copies of a written statement of your proposed testimony must be submitted before the commencement of the hearing. To the greatest extent practicable, please also provide a copy in electronic format, preferably in searchable pdf format. Written testimony and the Truth-In-Testimony disclosure form will be made publicly available and posted on the Committee's website.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
U.S. House of Representatives
Witness Disclosure Requirement - "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)(5)

1. Your Name:		
2. Are you testifying on behalf of the Federal, or a State or local government entity?	Yes	No
3. Are you testifying on behalf of an entity that is not a government entity?	Yes	No
4. Other than yourself, please list which entity or entities you are representing:		
5. Please list any Federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) that <u>you or the entity you represent have received on or after December 31, 2015:</u>		
6. Please list any foreign government payments that <u>you or the entity you represent have received on or after December 31, 2015:</u>		
7. If your answer to the question in item 3 in this form is "yes," please describe your position or representational capacity with the entity(ies) you are representing:		
8. If your answer to the question in item 3 is "yes," do any of the entities disclosed in item 4 have parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships that you are not representing in your testimony?	Yes	No
9. If the answer to the question in item 3 is "yes," please list any Federal grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) that were received by the entities listed under the question in item 4 on or after December 31, 2015, that exceed 10 percent of the revenue of the entities in the year received, including the source and amount of each grant or contract to be listed:		

I certify that the above information is true and correct.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

False Statements Act Certification

You are specifically advised that providing false information to this Committee/Subcommittee, or concealing material information from this Committee/Subcommittee, is a crime, and you can be punished for that. If you acknowledge this, please sign the bottom of this form and return to the Committee. This form will be made part of the hearing record.

.....
Witness signature

.....
Date

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/5/2018 7:02:15 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
CC: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks, Kyle. The Chairman is asking where EPA is in the process of providing this information. If you do not have a solid time estimate, can you at least tell me at what stage they are in the process? Any insight into what is being done would be helpful for me to pass along to Chairman Smith.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 5, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Thanks, Happy New Year to you as well. Unfortunately the folks running the search don't have any information for us yet. The search is still going and they don't yet have an estimate of when it will be done. I reiterated that this is priority for us and I can send you a timeline as soon as we know the number of possibly responsive documents. I realize this process is moving slowly and I appreciate your patience.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,
Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
202-225-8371

Message

From: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/5/2018 6:54:45 PM
To: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
CC: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Thanks, Happy New Year to you as well. Unfortunately the folks running the search don't have any information for us yet. The search is still going and they don't yet have an estimate of when it will be done. I reiterated that this is priority for us and I can send you a timeline as soon as we know the number of possibly responsive documents. I realize this process is moving slowly and I appreciate your patience.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,
Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [<mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
(202) 435-6371

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/24/2018 6:36:14 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: Follow Up

Hey Aaron,

I will plan to call you around 4:00 p.m. for an update on a witness for the Feb 6 hearing – does that work for you?

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/14/2018 10:17:49 PM
To: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]; Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: House Science Glyphosate followup call on Studies

Sven,

That's great, we will give you a call then.

Best,
Juliya

From: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [mailto:Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 4:58 PM
To: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>; Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Subject: House Science Glyphosate followup call on Studies

Juliya, how about a call tomorrow, Thurs, Feb 15 at 10:30am. Let me know if that works, call in number is 802.699.1047 code 6332422#. Thanks,
Sven

Sven-Erik Kaiser
U.S. EPA
Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations
1200 Pennsylvania Ave., NW (1305A)
Washington, DC 20460
202-566-2753 (o)
202-581-0619 (c)

From: Grigoryan, Juliya [mailto:Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 11:07 AM
To: Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Hearing followup

Hi Sven and Aaron,

Thank you both again for helping facilitate Dr. Lowit's appearance at the Feb 6 hearing. The Chairman had a couple follow-up questions for Dr. Lowit regarding the EPA process on evaluating glyphosate. Could we set up a quick call with our team? We are available today if that works for you all.

Best,

Juliya Grigoryan
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology

2321 Rayburn House Office Building

202-225-0816

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/9/2018 6:36:09 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: Follow up from Administrator Meeting

Hey Aaron,

I wanted to follow up with you regarding Chairman Smith's meeting with Administrator Pruitt. The Chairman has been asking me for an update on the progress of convening a staff meeting as agreed to in that meeting. I understand that you have been speaking on this issue internally with the Air Office and others. Is it possible that we can set a date for this meeting to take place so that we can meet and get a better understanding of a path forward? Our schedule is pretty flexible, but would be available to meet anytime on Thursday or Friday of next week or any time the week after. Please let me know if any of these days make sense for this meeting. Again, the Chairman has been asking me daily about the status of this meeting, so want to get something on the books as quickly as possible.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 625-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/17/2018 3:27:06 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
CC: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]; Rodrick, Christian [rodrick.christian@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Voicemail

Let's say 11:00 a.m. we will be here, thanks.

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2018 10:26 AM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>; Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Voicemail

Just stepped into a meeting we'll give you a ring in about 30 min if that works.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 17, 2018, at 10:24 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Just left you a voicemail regarding our recent conversation. Hope to hear back from you. Happy to have Mark Marin join our call as well.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/16/2018 5:00:42 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Phone Call

Great thanks Aaron.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 16, 2018, at 11:56 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

In a meeting, will call around 1pm if that works.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 16, 2018, at 11:28 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Hey Aaron,

Just left you a message – please let me know when might be a good time to chat.

Thanks,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 1/26/2018 4:55:58 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
CC: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Knapp, Kristien [Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov]; Yaeger, Ryan [Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Great. Thanks, Kyle. Please prioritize documents associated with Chloroprene, Libby Amphibole Asbestos, Trichloroethylene, and Arsenic.

We look forward to receiving them. Have a great weekend!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – We now have about 25,000 files retrieved through the centralized search to review for responsiveness. Please let me know if you'd like us to prioritize documents associated with any particular RFC:

- Chloroprene
- Libby amphibole asbestos
- Trichloroethylene
- Platinum
- Methanol
- Arsenic

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:42 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Sorry for the slow response. Thanks for this information, Kyle; it is helpful. Hope to hear from you all soon once the process is complete.

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2018 3:51 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – At this point, our eDiscovery division is still searching the Outlook accounts of all custodians that may have been involved in the IRIS RFC process for emails and attachments containing relevant keywords such as “RFC” and reference numbers for specific RFC requests. Once the search process is complete, the files will be processed and loaded into a review platform in which my team will review for responsiveness.

That’s all I have for now, but will keep you updated as the process progresses.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 2:02 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks, Kyle. The Chairman is asking where EPA is in the process of providing this information. If you do not have a solid time estimate, can you at least tell me at what stage they are in the process? Any insight into what is being done would be helpful for me to pass along to Chairman Smith.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 5, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Thanks, Happy New Year to you as well. Unfortunately the folks running the search don’t have any information for us yet. The search is still going and they don’t yet have an estimate of when it will be done. I reiterated that this is priority for us and I can send you a timeline as soon as we know the number of possibly responsive documents. I realize this process is moving slowly and I appreciate your patience.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,
Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [<mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
[202-225-6371](tel:202-225-6371)

Message

From: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/21/2018 4:11:54 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
CC: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Knapp, Kristien [Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov]; Yaeger, Ryan [Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Ok, great. Thanks

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 11:08 AM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Yes, I dropped off copies for the minority as well.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2018 9:08 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks, Kyle. I have received them. Can you please confirm that you dropped them off with the minority as well?

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 4:46 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – I will be dropping off this first set of documents shortly.

-Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 16, 2018, at 3:30 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Ok, thanks for the update. We look forward to receiving them on Tuesday. Enjoy the long weekend.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, February 16, 2018 3:26 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben,

Unfortunately I've just been informed that this document set will not clear our internal review process today. I expect the documents to be ready on Tuesday (2/20) and will plan to deliver then.

I apologize for the delay.

Have a nice weekend,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, February 09, 2018 12:19 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks for the update, Kyle. We look forward to receiving the first set by the end of next week.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2018 5:43 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – The first set of responsive documents is about 100 files and over 500 pages. It's going through our internal review process now. We aim to deliver it to you by the end of next week.

The second set will be roughly the same size, and we are aiming for the first or second week of March for delivery. We will plan to continue at roughly that pace of production until the request is fulfilled.

As I noted in an earlier email, we collected about 25,000 files that are possibly responsive. When we apply some narrower filters for your four priority chemicals, there are about 2500 possibly responsive documents. We'll continue to focus on this smaller set.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 1:19 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, I wanted to check on the current status of this document request. Please let me know if you can provide an idea of when we might receive this information.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Traynham, Ben
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:56 AM
To: 'Aarons, Kyle' <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Great. Thanks, Kyle. Please prioritize documents associated with Chloroprene, Libby Amphibole Asbestos, Trichloroethylene, and Arsenic.

We look forward to receiving them. Have a great weekend!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben -- We now have about 25,000 files retrieved through the centralized search to review for responsiveness. Please let me know if you'd like us to prioritize documents associated with any particular RFC:

- Chloroprene
- Libby amphibole asbestos
- Trichloroethylene
- Platinum
- Methanol
- Arsenic

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:42 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Sorry for the slow response. Thanks for this information, Kyle; it is helpful. Hope to hear from you all soon once the process is complete.

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2018 3:51 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – At this point, our eDiscovery division is still searching the Outlook accounts of all custodians that may have been involved in the IRIS RFC process for emails and attachments containing relevant keywords such as “RFC” and reference numbers for specific RFC requests. Once the search process is complete, the files will be processed and loaded into a review platform in which my team will review for responsiveness.

That’s all I have for now, but will keep you updated as the process progresses.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 2:02 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>

Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks, Kyle. The Chairman is asking where EPA is in the process of providing this information. If you do not have a solid time estimate, can you at least tell me at what stage they are in the process? Any insight into what is being done would be helpful for me to pass along to Chairman Smith.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 5, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben -- Thanks, Happy New Year to you as well. Unfortunately the folks running the search don't have any information for us yet. The search is still going and they don't yet have an estimate of when it will be done. I reiterated that this is priority for us and I can send you a timeline as soon as we know the number of possibly responsive documents. I realize this process is moving slowly and I appreciate your patience.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,
Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [<mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
[202-226-6371](tel:202-226-6371)

Message

From: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: 2/9/2018 5:18:34 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
CC: Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]; Knapp, Kristien [Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov]; Yaeger, Ryan [Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks for the update, Kyle. We look forward to receiving the first set by the end of next week.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 8, 2018 5:43 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – The first set of responsive documents is about 100 files and over 500 pages. It's going through our internal review process now. We aim to deliver it to you by the end of next week.

The second set will be roughly the same size, and we are aiming for the first or second week of March for delivery. We will plan to continue at roughly that pace of production until the request is fulfilled.

As I noted in an earlier email, we collected about 25,000 files that are possibly responsive. When we apply some narrower filters for your four priority chemicals, there are about 2500 possibly responsive documents. We'll continue to focus on this smaller set.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 08, 2018 1:19 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, I wanted to check on the current status of this document request. Please let me know if you can provide an idea of when we might receive this information.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Traynham, Ben
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:56 AM
To: 'Aarons, Kyle' <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Great. Thanks, Kyle. Please prioritize documents associated with Chloroprene, Libby Amphibole Asbestos, Trichloroethylene, and Arsenic.

We look forward to receiving them. Have a great weekend!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 11:23 AM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>; Knapp, Kristien <Knapp.Kristien@epa.gov>; Yaeger, Ryan <Yaeger.Ryan@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – We now have about 25,000 files retrieved through the centralized search to review for responsiveness. Please let me know if you'd like us to prioritize documents associated with any particular RFC:

- Chloroprene
- Libby amphibole asbestos
- Trichloroethylene
- Platinum
- Methanol
- Arsenic

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 11, 2018 9:42 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Sorry for the slow response. Thanks for this information, Kyle; it is helpful. Hope to hear from you all soon once the process is complete.

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Monday, January 8, 2018 3:51 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – At this point, our eDiscovery division is still searching the Outlook accounts of all custodians that may have been involved in the IRIS RFC process for emails and attachments containing relevant keywords such as “RFC” and reference numbers for specific RFC requests. Once the search process is complete, the files will be processed and loaded into a review platform in which my team will review for responsiveness.

That’s all I have for now, but will keep you updated as the process progresses.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 2:02 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks, Kyle. The Chairman is asking where EPA is in the process of providing this information. If you do not have a solid time estimate, can you at least tell me at what stage they are in the process? Any insight into what is being done would be helpful for me to pass along to Chairman Smith.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 5, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Thanks, Happy New Year to you as well. Unfortunately the folks running the search don’t have any information for us yet. The search is still going and they don’t yet have an estimate of when it will be done. I reiterated that this is priority for us and I can send you a timeline as soon as we know the number of possibly responsive documents. I realize this process is moving slowly and I appreciate your patience.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 11:11 AM

To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,

Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [<mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
[202-226-6371](tel:202-226-6371)

Message

From: Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: 1/8/2018 8:50:36 PM
To: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
CC: Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]; Ringel, Aaron [ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – At this point, our eDiscovery division is still searching the Outlook accounts of all custodians that may have been involved in the IRIS RFC process for emails and attachments containing relevant keywords such as “RFC” and reference numbers for specific RFC requests. Once the search process is complete, the files will be processed and loaded into a review platform in which my team will review for responsiveness.

That’s all I have for now, but will keep you updated as the process progresses.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 05, 2018 2:02 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Thanks, Kyle. The Chairman is asking where EPA is in the process of providing this information. If you do not have a solid time estimate, can you at least tell me at what stage they are in the process? Any insight into what is being done would be helpful for me to pass along to Chairman Smith.

Best,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 5, 2018 1:55 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Thanks, Happy New Year to you as well. Unfortunately the folks running the search don’t have any information for us yet. The search is still going and they don’t yet have an estimate of when it will be done. I reiterated that this is priority for us and I can send you a timeline as soon as we know the number of possibly responsive documents. I realize this process is moving slowly and I appreciate your patience.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons

Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, January 04, 2018 11:11 AM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Kyle, Happy New Year!

I am following up to see if you have heard from your tech folks yet. We would like to have a timeline on this document request as soon as possible.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, December 21, 2017 5:17 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hi Ben – Unfortunately I don't have much information to share. We're still waiting for potentially responsive documents from our tech folks that run the centralized search. I have an inquiry into them but haven't heard back. I'll update you when I know more.

Thanks,
Kyle

Kyle Aarons
Congressional Affairs
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
202-564-7351

From: Traynham, Ben [<mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 20, 2017 2:13 PM
To: Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Call Next Week?

Hey all, sorry we couldn't make this work. Main issue is just to follow up with Kyle about the internal communications request. Do you have an ETA on that information?

Thanks and happy holidays!

Ben

From: Aarons, Kyle [<mailto:Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>

Cc: Moody, Christina <Moody.Christina@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Hi all - Monday after 11 would work for me, or Tuesday after 10.

Thanks,
Kyle

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 15, 2017, at 1:38 PM, Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Sure, how about Monday between 10:30am-noon? Could also do Tuesday morning.

Thanks,
Ben

From: Moody, Christina [mailto:Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 1:13 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Call Next Week?

Looping in Kyle as well.

Christina J. Moody
US Environmental Protection Agency
Moody.Christina@epa.gov

On Dec 15, 2017, at 11:53 AM, Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov> wrote:

Sure, looping in Christina. When works for you?

-Aaron

From: Traynham, Ben [mailto:Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Friday, December 15, 2017 10:38 AM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Call Next Week?

Hey Aaron, can we schedule a call early next week to discuss the IRIS document productions?

Thanks, and have a great weekend!

Ben Traynham
Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building
[202-226-6371](tel:202-226-6371)

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 2/26/2018 5:03:28 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]; Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: ORD Budget Briefing Request

Thanks Joe, looping in Christina to help coordinate schedules and lock in times to brief ya'll here at EPA HQ.

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 26, 2018, at 11:54 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Good to see you at the Budget Symposium on Friday. As we discussed, the Committee requests a bipartisan staff level briefing to better understand the budget request as it pertains to the programs in the Science Committee's jurisdiction, specifically the Office of Research and Development. We are happy to accommodate EPA and attend this briefing at your office. We ask that you please schedule this briefing as soon as possible, we have a lot of flexibility the week of March 4th and at this time are available any morning except for Friday.

Please let us know what times work on your end.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 226-6371

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 1/24/2018 6:38:01 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Follow Up

Yep, that works.

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 1:36 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Follow Up

Hey Aaron,

I will plan to call you around 4:00 p.m. for an update on a witness for the Feb 6 hearing -- does that work for you?

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 2/15/2018 5:35:33 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Lyons, Troy [lyons.troy@epa.gov]; Christian Rodrick (Rodrick.Christian@epa.gov) [Rodrick.Christian@epa.gov]; Moody, Christina [Moody.Christina@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: EPA Budget Briefing

Will make sure you, and the committee staff, get it ASAP.

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Thursday, February 15, 2018 12:32 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Lyons, Troy <lyons.troy@epa.gov>
Subject: EPA Budget Briefing

Aaron,

I understand that that information pertaining to the EPA budget briefing on February 21st was sent out yesterday. The Science Committee has still not received any information on this briefing. Please send us this information ASAP.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 2/14/2018 4:12:17 PM
To: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
CC: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]; Traynham, Ben [Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov]; Rankin, Duncan [Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Hearing followup

Hi Juliya, happy to set up a call. Sven will coordinate, not sure what everyone's schedule looks like for today but we'll circle back around shortly.

-Aaron

From: Grigoryan, Juliya [mailto:Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, February 14, 2018 11:07 AM
To: Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>; Traynham, Ben <Ben.Traynham@mail.house.gov>; Rankin, Duncan <Duncan.Rankin@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Hearing followup

Hi Sven and Aaron,

Thank you both again for helping facilitate Dr. Lowit's appearance at the Feb 6 hearing. The Chairman had a couple follow-up questions for Dr. Lowit regarding the EPA process on evaluating glyphosate. Could we set up a quick call with our team? We are available today if that works for you all.

Best,

Juliya Grigoryan

Counsel | Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space, and Technology
2321 Rayburn House Office Building

202-225-6816

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 1/18/2018 7:12:28 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: Witnesses

Do you know who else will be testifying besides EPA?

Aaron E. Ringel

*Deputy Associate Administrator
Office of Congressional & Intergovernmental Relations
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency*

W: 202.564.4373

Ringel.Aaron@epa.gov

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 1/17/2018 3:28:32 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]; Rodrick, Christian [rodrick.christian@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Voicemail

Works. Thx.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 17, 2018, at 10:28 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Let's say 11:00 a.m. we will be here, thanks.

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, January 17, 2018 10:26 AM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>; Aarons, Kyle <Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov>; Rodrick, Christian <rodrick.christian@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Voicemail

Just stepped into a meeting we'll give you a ring in about 30 min if that works.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 17, 2018, at 10:24 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Just left you a voicemail regarding our recent conversation. Hope to hear back from you. Happy to have Mark Marin join our call as well.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-5371

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 1/17/2018 3:25:50 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]; Aarons, Kyle [Aarons.Kyle@epa.gov]; Rodrick, Christian [rodrick.christian@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: Voicemail

Just stepped into a meeting we'll give you a ring in about 30 min if that works.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 17, 2018, at 10:24 AM, Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov> wrote:

Aaron,

Just left you a voicemail regarding our recent conversation. Hope to hear back from you. Happy to have Mark Marin join our call as well.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 1/16/2018 9:47:27 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Yep, that works, thanks.

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Sure -- would 10:00 a.m. work?

From: Ringel, Aaron [mailto:ringel.aaron@epa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 4:45 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph <Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>; Kaiser, Sven-Erik <Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Hey Joe, do you have time tomorrow to do a quick call with Sven and I over here about this proposed hearing?

Thanks,

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Witness Request February 6

Aaron,

The Science Committee is holding a Full Committee hearing that will examine the recent studies on glyphosate. As are you aware, EPA has undertaken extensive review of glyphosate in the re-registration process and have found that it is not likely to be carcinogenic. The Chairman is very interested in having EPA provide testimony on its extensive research of this chemical and the processes that are currently in place at EPA to provide this analysis. We aim to show that EPA's current scientific examination is credible and based on sound science. We would like to contrast this with recent scientific reports in the IARC monograph program, which cause confusion for consumers and regulators, as these reports are often based on questionable science and the pre-cautionary principal. Please let us know when you have identified the appropriate witness to testify on February 6th at 10:00 a.m. Always happy to discuss more on the phone.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 556-3711

Not for Public Distribution

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 1/16/2018 9:44:45 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
CC: Grigoryan, Juliya [Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov]; Kaiser, Sven-Erik [Kaiser.Sven-Erik@epa.gov]
Subject: RE: Witness Request February 6

Hey Joe, do you have time tomorrow to do a quick call with Sven and I over here about this proposed hearing?

Thanks,

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Cc: Grigoryan, Juliya <Juliya.Grigoryan@mail.house.gov>
Subject: Witness Request February 6

Aaron,

The Science Committee is holding a Full Committee hearing that will examine the recent studies on glyphosate. As are you aware, EPA has undertaken extensive review of glyphosate in the re-registration process and have found that it is not likely to be carcinogenic. The Chairman is very interested in having EPA provide testimony on its extensive research of this chemical and the processes that are currently in place at EPA to provide this analysis. We aim to show that EPA's current scientific examination is credible and based on sound science. We would like to contrast this with recent scientific reports in the IARC monograph program, which cause confusion for consumers and regulators, as these reports are often based on questionable science and the pre-cautionary principal. Please let us know when you have identified the appropriate witness to testify on February 6th at 10:00 a.m. Always happy to discuss more on the phone.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371

Message

From: Ringel, Aaron [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=1654BDC951284A6D899A418A89FB0ABF-RINGEL, AAR]
Sent: 1/16/2018 7:38:31 PM
To: Brazauskas, Joseph [Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Subject: RE: Circling Back on Administrator Meeting

Thanks Joe, working to coordinate for you on both emails!

Best,

-Aaron

From: Brazauskas, Joseph [mailto:Joseph.Brazauskas@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, January 16, 2018 1:35 PM
To: Ringel, Aaron <ringel.aaron@epa.gov>
Subject: Circling Back on Administrator Meeting

Aaron,

It was great to see you last week and appreciate the Administrator's time. Chairman Smith is very keen for our staff to get together to discuss further transparent science-based regulations at the EPA. We can meet at your earliest convenience with the appropriate EPA staff to discuss this matter further. When you have identified who is best to handle this matter moving forward please let me know and we can schedule some time to discuss. Hope to hear from you soon. Next week we are not in session so we should have a number of days and times available.

Thank you,
Joe

Joseph A. Brazauskas
Staff Director and Senior Counsel
Subcommittee on Environment
Committee on Science, Space and Technology
Lamar Smith, Chairman
P: (202) 225-6371